

THE ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XIX.—PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY.—NUMBER CX.

MARCH — APRIL, 1893

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 1. THE HIGHER CRITICISM, AND ITS APPLICATION TO THE BIBLE. <i>Professor Edward Lewis Curtis</i> | 137 |
| 2. THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S AUTHORITY AS A LAWGIVER. <i>Rev. G. F. Genung</i> | 155 |
| 3. MISSIONS AND CIVILIZATION. III. <i>Rev. Charles C. Starbuck</i> | 167 |
| 4. PHILLIPS BROOKS. <i>Professor William Lawrence</i> | 183 |
| 5. A CALL TO PRESBYTERIAN LAYMEN. <i>George A. Strong, Esq.</i> | 193 |
| 6. THE ANDOVER BAND IN MAINE. <i>Rev. Edward G. Porter</i> | 198 |
| 7. MORALITY ON A SCIENTIFIC BASIS. <i>Rev. James T. Bixby</i> | 208 |
| 8. EDITORIAL. | |
| THE CASE OF PROFESSOR H. P. SMITH | 221 |
| The Charges against Professor Smith | 228 |
| THE AMERICAN POLICY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH | 230 |
| PHILLIPS BROOKS | 235 |
| 9. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES. | |
| Hyde's Practical Ethics, 245. — Seelye's Duty, 245. — Everett's Ethics for Young People, 245. — Bartlett's and Peters's The Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian, 247. — Schaff's Theological Propædæutic, 249. — Lagarde's Septuaginta Studien, 251. — Adams's Creation of the Bible, 253. — The City and the Land, 255. — Herron's The Call of the Cross, 256. — Stevens's The Pauline Theology, 257. — Schaff's History of the Christian Church, Vol. VII. The Swiss Reformation, 259. — Robinson's and James's The Gospel according to Peter, and The Revelation of Peter, 262. — Harris's The Newly Recovered Gospel of Saint Peter, 262. — Headlam's Recently Discovered Early Christian Documents, 262. — Harnack's Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus, 262. | |
| 10. BOOKS RECEIVED | 266 |

BOSTON
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

LONDON: GAY AND BIRD, 27 KING WILLIAM STREET, STRAND

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 50 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$3.00

Dana Public Library 93.29

FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.

AN OUTLINE HANDBOOK OF
The * Life * of * Christ.

This Handbook has been prepared by William Arnold Stevens, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Rochester Theological Seminary, and Ernest De Witt Burton, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the University of Chicago, and is arranged in Parts, Chapters and Sections.

Interested teachers are cordially invited
to send for sample pages and explanatory circular, both of which are sent free
on application.

The Bible Study Publishing Company,
21 BROMFIELD STREET, BOSTON.

What COLGATE ^{ACADEMY} UNIVERSITY says.

Colgate Academy, Rev. JOHN GREENE, Ph. D., *Principal.*

Hamilton, N. Y., *January 18, 1893.*

Some of my teachers are now upon the second year of their experience with the Inductive Studies on the Life of Christ. I am well along with the studies upon the History of the Early Church. It is possible, therefore, to state the impression both of teachers and of pupils who have tried these, and, of course, the International Lessons before them. It is my clear conviction that nothing so helpful, so suggestive, and giving so large promise of permanent and growing results, has hitherto been published in the way of helps for our Bible Schools. The students attending our Colgate Academy Bible-classes are largely students for the ministry, and may be presumed, therefore, to know more of the Bible already than the average Sunday-school scholar. These pupils are emphatic in their preference for these series over any other lessons they have ever used. The teachers are equally enthusiastic.

You and your co-workers are to be congratulated upon this success, and I feel sure that ultimately the church will acknowledge widely her obligation to the promoters of this work. . . .

Yours fraternally,
(Signed) JOHN GREENE.

Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

Please send at once 25 copies of Life of Christ, Progressive Grade. The demand for these by our church people in general is very surprising. *Our numbers have increased very much, our attendance is much more regular,* the whole school (about 300), which has been like a dead weight on my heart for the year I have had charge of it, really seems alive, active, and enthusiastic. Teachers' meeting, which formerly seemed absolutely without interest and success, now is well attended and interesting.

Very truly,
(Signed) R. W. MOORE, Professor Modern Languages.

For further information, free specimens, circulars, etc., address

THE BIBLE STUDY PUBLISHING CO.,
21 Bromfield Street, Boston, Mass.

at
re
rt
g,
y

6c



THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL BI-MONTHLY.

VOL. XIX. — MARCH-APRIL, 1893. — No. CX.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM, AND ITS APPLICATION
TO THE BIBLE.

THE Higher Criticism is a method of knowledge of literature. When a writing is presented of which information is desired the following questions are usually asked: First, Are its teachings or ideas true? Secondly, Are its statements of fact correct? Thirdly, Have we rightly understood the writer's meaning? Fourthly, By whom and when was it written? Fifthly, What is its literary form and structure? And sixthly, What is the state of its text?

This is an order of interest. In investigation this order would be reversed. The question of text would come first; then, that of literary character, whether prose or poetry, fiction or history; then, that of authorship and date, to obtain the influence of personality and time; then, that of interpretation; then, that of the trustworthiness of the statements of fact; and lastly, the question of the truth of the teachings. These are the inquiries naturally made concerning any piece of literature. Criticism is the process of obtaining the answers to them. It is a method of knowledge, a test or a search after truth; and it is as varied as the answers sought, and thus of several kinds: textual criticism, literary criticism, exegetical criticism, historical criticism, and finally philosophical criticism. These criticisms are not entirely independent of one another; they overlap and blend together. That is, the data furnished by one are needful or helpful in the application of another. This has already been intimated in giving the logical order of these criticisms. But the higher ones affect also the lower. The literary form may help restore the text. Linguistic marks may determine the date, the *terminus a quo* of

a document. The historical credibility of the record of a miracle needs the support of philosophical criticism to establish in the first instance the reasonableness of such an event. But especially so blended together in their application and so dependent upon one another are the processes of answering the questions of literary form and structure, authorship and date, and historical credibility, that these have been regarded as forming one department of criticism to which has been given the name of Higher Criticism, to distinguish it from the lower or textual criticism. The higher criticism, then, is that method of knowledge which determines the literary form and structure, authorship and date, and the historical credibility of writings: and especially so from the study of the writings themselves. While it does not ignore external or purely historical testimony, it makes especial use of the internal characteristics of writings.

This higher criticism has probably always in a certain degree been in vogue ever since literature began; and yet as an exact and thorough method of information it is modern. The knowledge of ancient literature in reference to date, authorship, literary form and historical credibility has been corrected and vastly increased during the last two centuries. Look, for example, at Roman literature. "In the first two centuries after the invention of printing," says Sir George C. Lewis, "the entire history of Rome was in general treated as entitled to implicit belief; all ancient authors were put upon the same footing and regarded as equally credible; all parts of an author's work were supposed to rest upon the same basis. Not only was Livy's authority as high as that of Thucydides and Tacitus, but his account of the kings was considered as credible as that of the wars with Hannibal, Philip Antiochus, or Perseus; and again, the lives of Romulus, Numa, Coriolanus, by Plutarch were deemed as veracious as those of Fabius Maximus, Sylla, or Cicero. Machiavel in his discourses on the first Decade of Livy takes this view of the early history. The seven kings of Rome are to him not less real than the twelve Cæsars; the examples which he derives from the early period of the republic are not less certain and authentic than if they had been selected from the civil wars of Marius and Sylla or of Cæsar and Pompey."¹

How different the present estimates of the descriptions of the early period of Rome! Now we are told that a history of this early Roman state is out of the question; that "the names,

¹ *Credibility of the Early Roman History*, vol. i. p. 2.

dates, and achievements of the first four kings are too unsubstantial to form the basis of a sober narrative: a few points only can be considered well established."¹ Or as another authority, Professor J. R. Seeley, of Cambridge, England, says, "Is it then possible to know anything about the early history of Rome? Nothing, I think, from the history books taken alone, and about that part of the history which deals with particular persons nothing from any source."²

This change of view is vividly illustrated by comparing the statement concerning Livy in the seventh edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica," published about fifty years ago, with that in the recent ninth edition. The former contains only words of praise. "Never man was furnished," it is said, "with greater advantages for writing a history than Livy. Besides his own great genius, which was in every respect formed for the purpose, he was trained, as it were, in a city at that time the empress of the world, and in the politest reign that ever was, having scarcely any other school than the court of Augustus. He had access to the very best materials," etc., etc. The article then quotes approvingly the eulogy of Livy and other ancient historians by Lord Bolingbroke. But in the ninth edition we are told that Livy while a "consummate artist" was "an unskilled, and often careless investigator and critic." Not only are his inaccuracies brought to light, but the character of his sources is also exhibited. His work is finally summarized as follows:—

"Livy's history then rests on no foundation of original research, or even of careful verification. It is a compilation, and even as such it leaves much to be desired. For we cannot credit Livy with having made such a preliminary survey of his authorities as would enable him to determine their relation to each other, and fuse their various narratives into a consistent whole. It is clear on the contrary that his circle of authorities for any one decade was a comparatively small one, that of these he selected one, and transcribed him with necessary embellishments and other slight modifications until impelled by various reasons to drop him. He then, without warning, takes up another whom he follows in the same way. The result is a curious mosaic, in which pieces of all colors and dates are found side by side, and in which even the great artistic skill displayed throughout fails to conceal the lack of internal unity."

¹ *Encyc. Brit.* 9th ed. art. "Rome," p. 733.

² Livy, Bk. I., J. R. Seeley, p. 53.

When we turn to other fields of literature besides the Roman we find similar new and fuller knowledge, which is the achievement of modern higher criticism. Until very recently the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were generally regarded as the work of one author. The verdict of scholarship is now the other way. Many writings have been found to be spurious which formerly were received as genuine, such as the letters of Phalaris, the fables of Æsop, certain Ignatian epistles, certain homilies of Clement, etc. Many interpolations also have been discovered in ancient writings. Their structure has likewise been discerned, and the documents in many instances underlying them have been pointed out. There have been both positive and negative results. Of the former we hear less perhaps than of the latter, because there is little occasion for announcing the confirmation of old and received opinions. But whatever views are now held of literature among scholars, their correctness has really been demonstrated by the process of the higher criticism. Such, then, is the field of this science, and such are its results.

We consider in the next place its method. The method is inductive, — the same as that of all modern sciences. The successful critic seeking to answer the questions presented by literature is guided by the phenomena of the writings before him. He sees much that others have never noticed, and discerns the relation between what he sees and certain causes, and is thereby led to fixed and definite conclusions respecting the origin of these phenomena. Sometimes it is urged, as an argument against accepting the results of the higher criticism, that intelligent men have for centuries been reading the same writings, and yet have never observed what the critics have, and have never come to their conclusions. But this holds true of this earth of ours. Intelligent men have been looking at and enjoying nature for millenniums, and yet have never observed what modern naturalists have or come to their conclusions. The scholar Bentley examined the letters of Phalaris. From the mention of towns which did not exist in the time of the tyrant, from the reference to authors who wrote long after he was dead, from reference to tragedies, although tragedy had not yet been invented in the lifetime of Phalaris, from the dialect, which was not Dorian but late Attic, as well as from absurdities in the matter and from the entire absence of any reference to the letters before Stobæus, who lived apparently about 500 A. D., Bentley sufficiently proved that the letters were written by a Sophist rhetorician hundreds of years after the death of Phalaris.

The critic of the *Odyssey* finds that this poem differs from the *Iliad*, in the messenger of Zeus, in the wife of Hephæstus, in the food of the heroes, in the cities ascribed to Crete, in the use of many words, in the historical tone and character, in the introduction of the supernatural element, in the character of Ulysses, in the position of Zeus, in the conceptions of morality, and from all these reasons, especially in the absence of any external proof to the contrary, he concludes that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were not composed by the same author.

Such processes of obtaining knowledge are higher criticism. The method, as has already been stated, is inductive. The results are of various degrees of probability; from that which is a plausible conjecture to that which amounts to a fixed certainty.

In seeking information in this way there is, of course, liability to error. Our knowledge of the past is often obscure. Cities may have been of an earlier date than we had supposed, and likewise ideas. The intellectual horizon, vocabulary, and fertility of invention of writers may have been far greater than we had imagined. A later hand may have revised the documents. Statements which we thought rested on oral tradition, and hence regarded unreliable, may have come, carved on stone, from contemporaries, and thus have been most trustworthy. Many phenomena may have been overlooked. And thus through ignorance, through superficiality, through wrong inferences, the conclusions advanced by critics have often been incorrect. The history of the higher criticism, like that of every other inductive science, contains the record of many mistakes and false announcements. And yet through this criticism real knowledge is attained, and it is a reliable source of information, as much so as the other inductive sciences. There have been remarkable verifications of the conjectures of higher critics.

In the present text of Demosthenes' oration, "On the Crown," there are passages which for a long time have been regarded by the critics as interpolations. This view has been confirmed by the discovery of the exact length of the original oration. The present text fits the measure given with the conjectured interpolations removed.

The "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," discovered a few years ago, verified in a signal manner the conclusions of higher criticism. A German scholar, Bickell, in 1843, and another, Gebhardt, more recently, had argued that there must have been some such document underlying both the seventh book of the "Apostolic

Constitutions" and the "Apostolic Epitome." In 1882 still another scholar, Krawutzky, undertook from these sources to reconstruct the imbedded earlier and simpler document. His attempt, as is now seen, was most successful.¹ As one has said, "It was considered a wonderful achievement of astronomy and verification of its most speculative mathematical instruments when a planet appeared where theoretic science showed that it was needed. The higher historical criticism has the same vindication in Bryennios' 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.'"²

Twenty years ago a German scholar examined a work entitled "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod," by a Greek Sophist of the second century, and the legend upon which it was based, and from a few stray hints in the only known authorities came to the conclusion that the story was old and widely spread before the second century, and that the author of the present account had used ancient materials, and that certain lines had been literally transcribed from this ancient source and were not the invention of a later date. In 1889 a papyrus was discovered in a mummy-case in Egypt containing this ancient source and confirming in this unexpected manner the conclusions of the higher criticism of twenty years ago.³

Now the Bible, as a library of literature, is open to the same critical process which we have been describing, and if this critical process has led to more exact knowledge respecting other literature, we may be confident that it will do so when applied to the Scriptures. And, unquestionably, it has already done so. Formerly the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were regarded as independent of one another, and their similarity in expression was thought to be due entirely to their common subject-matter. Now, however, this similarity is believed to arise also from the use of a common literary source. Hence in those parts of the Gospels our primary witness to the sayings or deeds of Christ is one instead of three. Likewise we are compelled to recognize a subjective coloring in the discourses of the fourth Gospel. It is the higher criticism also which confirms the opinion that the Epistle to the Hebrews is the work of another author than Paul.

But while the higher criticism has led to a change in regard to some of the old views respecting the New Testament, it has done a more important work in confirming the general belief of the

¹ *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Hitchcock and Brown, p. v.

² Professor E. C. Smyth in the *Andover Review*, April, 1884, p. 435.

³ "The Flinders-Petrie Papyri, Mahaffy," *The Dial*, June, 1892, p. 49.

Christian Church, in vindicating the authenticity of many of the New Testament writings. The Tübingen school, for example, denied the apostolic authorship of the Gospel of John. The argument presented was twofold,—the lack of external testimony, and the internal evidence. The question of both belonged to the higher criticism, inasmuch as the external evidence, if there was any, had to be gathered from a mass of early literature whose date and form had first to be determined. Now an argument built upon the higher criticism requires to be answered by the same method. Criticism must meet criticism. And this was done. The higher criticism of evangelical scholarship vindicated the authenticity of the Gospel. The process was exactly identical with that pursued in the investigations of other literature. First, it was shown that the Gospel was accepted as genuine in the second half of the second century, and then that there were unmistakable allusions to it in the first half of the second century. But especially was its authorship proved by a painstaking examination of the literary and historical features of the Gospel. From its portrait of Christ, its general structure and contents, was its historical truth shown; from allusions to place and custom, that its author was a Jew; from graphic touches, that he was an eye-witness and participant in the scenes recorded; and from the Gospel itself, that he was none other than the Apostle John. Such, then, is the debt of the evangelical church to the higher criticism.

The destructive criticism represented by the Tübingen school was not only faulty like some of that of classical literature, through a lack of soberness, but was also vitiated by a subjective element. It rested upon a philosophical assumption, and also an historical one, both of which are false. The philosophical was that of naturalism: the disbelief in miracles was regarded as a foregone conclusion. The historical premise was the assumed hostility of the Petrine and Pauline theologies and of the two apostles themselves.¹ Much of the present higher criticism of the Old Testament is undoubtedly affected by similar false assumptions. An acute reviewer of Kuenen's critical method said: "One of his proofs that the narratives of Genesis cannot be historical is the fact that they represent the patriarchs as not inferior to the prophets of the eighth century in pureness of religious insight and inward spiritual piety."² Another proof is that the familiar

¹ Fisher's *Supernatural Origin of Christianity*, p. xxxvii.

² Cf. *Religion of Israel*, vol. i., p. 108.

intercourse of the patriarchs with the Deity shows the accounts to be legendary. The first of these proofs rests on the assumption that all religions arise by evolution, and never by direct revelation, and that the evolutionary process must have been further advanced in the eighth century than in the previous centuries. The second rests on the broader assumption that what is commonly called the supernatural is incredible."¹

We must not, however, fail to recognize the possibility that higher criticism, even when accompanied by false assumptions, may call attention to features of the Bible which before had been overlooked, and thus contribute to our better understanding of the Sacred Scriptures. Unquestionably rationalists have enlightened us on many points, and the evangelical church is indebted to the scholarship of a Gesenius, an Ewald, and a Kuenen.

The fact that Biblical higher criticism has often been pursued on a rationalistic basis has led some to suppose that such a basis necessarily underlies it. A writer in a recent review has said: "Its chief, its fundamental *a priori* principle is that a miracle in any form or shape is impossible."² Another has stated as its fundamental principle that "the Bible is the product of natural development alone."³ Such statements are misrepresentations of our science, however faithfully they may portray the positions of certain critics.

But while the assumptions of rationalism may vitiate the processes of the higher criticism of the Old Testament on the one hand, on the other dogmatism may allow to the believer in Christ and supernatural Christianity only the most limited sphere for their application. Many regard the questions of authorship and historical credibility of the Old Testament as already settled by the testimony of Christ and his Apostles. The late Dr. Howard Crosby said: "We hold, therefore, the position impregnable that our Lord declared the Pentateuch to be the work of Moses, and that his testimony is final."⁴ Dr. E. P. Goodwin, of Chicago, in his sermon before the International Congregational Council, at London, in 1891, expressed a similar opinion, saying: "Does He [Christ] set himself to the task of correcting the Apostles as to

¹ Professor W. J. Beecher, D. D., in the *Presbyterian Review*, vol. iii. October, 1882, p. 729.

² Dr. Robert Watts, Belfast, in the *Homiletical Review*, January, 1892, p. 13.

³ Professor Howard Osgood, D. D., Rochester, N. Y., in the *Independent*, July 30, 1891.

⁴ The *Independent*, February, 1883.

their belief in the authorship of the book ascribed to Moses, the Psalms ascribed to David, or the prophecies to Isaiah?"¹

The true position for the believing critic, we hold, is neither that of the rationalist nor of the dogmatist. The evangelical Christian, when he undertakes the work of the higher criticism, owing to his own experience and that of his fellow-believers cannot assume that the Bible is like all other books, and that the history of Israel which culminates in Christ, the source of his spiritual life, is like all other history, and hence that miracles recorded in the Bible are equally improbable with those mentioned in other histories. As well might you urge a resident of Africa, after he had experienced torrid heat, to assume that the climate of the dark continent was that of England, and hence that the record of a higher temperature in the former country than that ever known in the latter was probably false. A miracle recorded in the Biblical history is to the evangelical Christian a reasonable event, and the record of its occurrence he will test as he does that of any other event. Already in this way he has received as historic the narrative of Christ's resurrection; and in the light of this event other miracles are both reasonable and probable; and any one recorded in the Scriptures should not be viewed simply as a single event, but as one of a series of events which find their culmination in Christ's resurrection. This fact should never be lost sight of in the study of the Bible, and may serve as an Ariadne's thread to lead one out of many difficulties. It, however, is no guarantee that unhistorical records of miracles may not appear in the Bible, and, unless one is committed on *a priori* grounds to a belief in the inerrancy of the Scriptures as a necessary complement to their religious teaching, he will feel free to discriminate in reference to Biblical miracles as he does in reference to other events recorded in the Scriptures. In this way such evangelical believers as Weiss and Meyer, who heartily accept Christ's resurrection, doubt the occurrence of the resurrection of the dead near Jerusalem at the time of Christ's death, recorded by Matthew (xxvii. 52 f.).

"The historical evidence for the New Testament miracle is also much stronger and more conclusive than that for most of the Old Testament miracles. The devout Christian, as he reads the narratives of wonderful events which occur in different parts of the Bible, is called upon to make distinctions in the interest both of faith and of reason. He may make such distinctions with safety.

¹ *Report of Council*, p. 67.

He may thus hold to the firm centre of faith which surrounds his Redeemer. He may, without detriment to his faith, regard the evidence for the miracles of the Old Testament as weaker, historically considered, and yet as strengthened by the relations in which, as a rule, they stand to that divine process of revelation which culminates in the Redeemer. If he discovers reason to believe that any of these remote occurrences have, on account of the relative darkness of the times, been only obscurely seen and apprehended, and not perfectly reported by the Hebrew writer, he need feel no alarm at this discovery. If he finds Biblical critics maintaining the opinion that this is so, he need take no offense at it. The real cause of the Bible is endangered only when we so link what is essential and indubitable with what is unessential and doubtful, that the two in our thoughts stand and fall together.”¹

The evangelical critic will refuse also to grant that because Christ was God incarnated to reveal religious truth and to redeem mankind, that it belonged likewise to his mission to correct the errors and mistakes of his contemporaries in matters of historical and physical science, and thus anticipate or foreclose a development in these sciences. He will refuse to be forced with Mr. Huxley and Dr. Goodwin into the awful dilemma of choosing between Christ and criticism. Questions which are not of the religious teachings of the Old Testament will to him be open to be tested according to the method of the sciences to which they belong.

“It is not contrary to the catholic doctrine of our Lord’s person to suppose that in such matters his knowledge was the knowledge of his times. There can be no impropriety or irreverence in such a view, when we are expressly told that He ‘advanced in wisdom’ as well as in stature (Luke ii. 52); and in regard to at least one matter He himself expressly declared that his knowledge was limited, when He said, ‘of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father’ (Mark xii. 32); and this although it was a matter of supreme importance, and intimately connected with his own work. But apart from this mysterious question of the limitation of our Lord’s knowledge as a man, it is difficult to see how He could (with reverence be it said) have done otherwise in literary matters than adopt the ordinary language of the time. He used, as we still use, popular and not scientifically accurate

¹ *What is the Bible?* By George T. Ladd, D. D., pp. 177 f.

language with regard to natural phenomena, such as the rising and the setting of the sun. And, in like manner, it is difficult to see how He could have avoided using the language of tradition with the nomenclature of the Books of the Old Testament."¹

From this point of view many scholars devout and loyal to Jesus Christ are studying the Old Testament, seeking for the authorship, date, literary character, and historical credibility of those writings. And there is urgent demand for their work. The old or traditional opinions on these subjects rest too often simply on Jewish tradition. This seems to have been sufficient for our fathers. Moses Stuart, speaking of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, said: "Enough that this matter rests on the universal tradition and belief of the Jews in all ages; in the same manner that the authorship of the Iliad, or the Odyssey, or of the *Æneid*, or of the *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, or the work *de Bello Peloponnessiaco*, and the like, rests on the traditionary and universal belief of the nations to whom the works belong."²

But, as we have seen in the case of the Odyssey, to modern scholarship the resting "on traditionary and universal belief" is not sufficient to establish the authorship of any of these ancient writings, and hence it is not sufficient to establish that of the Pentateuch.

The higher criticism is needed to put our knowledge of the Old Testament upon a firm and respectable basis. These Scriptures must be taken out of the realm of supposition and fancy. If the old views concerning them are correct they will surely ultimately be confirmed by criticism. "It is impossible for God to lie" either in history or nature; and criticism is a method of determining what God through man or nature has wrought.

Our critical process, however, should be a sober one. Just now there is danger that theory be a guide rather than evidence. "The main cause," says Sir George C. Lewis, "of the great multiplicity and wide divergence of opinions which characterize the recent researches into early Roman history is the defective method which not only Niebuhr and his followers, but most of his opponents have adopted. Instead of employing those tests of credibility which are consistently applied to modern history, they attempt to guide their judgment by the indications of internal evidence, and assume that the truth can be discovered by an

¹ Kirkpatrick's *Divine Library of the Old Testament*, pp. 9 f.

² *Critical History and Defense of the Old Testament Canon*, p. 49.

occult faculty of historical divination. . . . It is not enough for an historian to claim the possession of a retrospective second sight, which is denied to the rest of the world; of a mysterious doctrine, revealed only to the initiated. Unless he can prove as well as guess; unless he can produce evidence of the fact, after he has intuitively perceived its existence, his historical system cannot be received." ¹

This statement is applicable to Biblical criticism. There have been too many guesses. Not all, however, on one side. Unfounded assumptions, specious arguments, abound in orthodox commentaries, as well as in the works of rationalists.

Certain of the conclusions, however, of the higher critics appear well founded, and it is interesting to notice how parallel the evidence for them is with that presented in the case of other literature, and likewise the similarity of other literary phenomena with the results which they have reached. Compare, for example, the evidence for the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch with that for the unauthenticity of the letters of Phalaris.

In the letters of Phalaris, "the mention of cities not yet built." Likewise in the Pentateuch, Abram pursued the forces of Chedorlaomer as far as Dan (Gen. xiv. 14). But the city Dan, according to Judg. xviii. 29, was not founded until long after the time of Moses. Canaan, in Gen. xl. 15, is called the land of the Hebrews; this name would naturally have been used only after the settlement of Canaan by the children of Israel. The villages of Jair are mentioned in Num. xxxii. 41, and Deut. iii. 14; but Jair, after whom they were called according to Judg. x. 3 f, was one of the judges of Israel.

The second evidence in the letters of Phalaris is, "the imitation of authors who wrote long after he was dead."

Parallel with this in the case of the Pentateuch are expressions which most probably or necessarily could have been written only after Moses' death. Among these are: "And the Canaanite was then in the land" (Gen. xii. 6). "And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years until they came unto a land inhabited" (Ex. xvi. 35). "As Israel did unto the land of his possession, which the Lord gave unto them" (Deut. ii. 12). "Unto this day," in its connection (Deut. iii. 14).

In the letters of Phalaris, "reference to tragedies, though tragedy was not yet invented."

In the Pentateuch, reference is made to a king in Israel, al-

¹ *Credibility of Early Roman History*, pp. 13, 15.

though there was none until hundreds of years after the time of Moses (Gen. xxxvi. 39).

In the letters of Phalaris, "the dialect not Dorian but Attic."

In the Pentateuch, as a complement of this, we may mention legislation implying a post-Mosaic era; the law, for example, concerning the king (Deut. xvii. 14-20).

In the letters of Phalaris, "absurdities in the matter."

In the Pentateuch, features which can scarcely be strictly historical and written by a contemporary. Among these are the numbers assigned to the children of Israel, the population of a military age being 600,000, and hence the entire host between two and three millions. This looks like a gross exaggeration, similar to that of Herodotus in reference to the number of Xerxes' army which invaded Greece; for it is difficult to conceive of such a host, especially with their flocks and herds and all the baggage of camp equipment, being mobilized and crossing the Red Sea in a single night. The entire number of males also would be at least 900,000, but the firstborn males are given as only 22,273 (Num. iii. 43), which would imply that each mother in Israel had forty-two male children.

In Numbers xxxi. there is an account of 12,000 soldiers of Israel "avenging Jehovah on Midian," by killing in battle and siege (computing from the number of captives mentioned in verses 7, 17, 18, and 35) some 88,000 warriors, and then butchering in cold blood a similar number of women and girls and 32,000 boys, and carrying off as slaves 32,000 young girls, *without the loss of a man* (v. 49).

These features of the Pentateuchal narrative, of which many additional similar examples can be given, appear like the representations of a later uncritical age, and not the sober statements of an eye-witness. With the other post-Mosaic data they are frequently explained as not belonging to the original narrative, but as glosses or later additions. This might be accepted as satisfactory did they not recur so often and in such a manner as to show that they belong to the original text. And, indeed, this explanation, as it is now advanced, destroys to a great degree the historical value of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, for it assumes that the work of Moses, instead of having been kept singularly pure in all ages, contains "many omissions, repetitions, additions, glosses, and corruptions and falsifications of the text."¹

¹ See the statement of the Bishop of Colchester in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1892, p. 723.

And finally, in respect to the letters of Phalaris, "the entire absence of any reference to them until the time of Stobæus, hundreds of years later."

Likewise, in the case of the Pentateuch, the strange silence for many centuries regarding such an authoritative body of law and the observance of its institutions.

Thus in this Pentateuchal criticism the line of argument is of exactly the same nature as that used in the criticism of other literature. And if we accept it as valid in one instance shall we not in the other?

We have given, however, but a portion of the argument of the critics for the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The argument as a whole is cumulative. That already given is confirmed by the fact that there are different codes in the Pentateuch, which in their differences imply different historical backgrounds, that the history of Israel presents stages of religious, political, and social life corresponding to these backgrounds, and that the literature of Israel in these stages apparently refers to these codes.

The theory of the critics that the Pentateuch was compiled out of older documents has often been ridiculed, as if it was absurd to think that any ancient writing could ever have been composed in such a "crazy-patchwork manner." But we find a parallel in Tatian's *Diatessaron*,¹ a harmony of the four Gospels made in the second century; and we need only to give the statement, which we have already mentioned, descriptive of Livy's history, where it is said: "He selected one authority and transcribed him with the necessary embellishments and other slight modifications, until impelled by various reasons to drop him. He then without warning takes up another whom he follows in the same way. The result is a curious mosaic, in which pieces of all colors and dates are found side by side, and in which even the great artistic skill displayed throughout fails to conceal the lack of internal unity."

It is often urged that so intelligent a writer as the author of the Pentateuch would not have placed in his narrative inconsistencies and doublets. Yet Livy did this very thing, piecing together differently colored accounts of the same event, and introducing two or more versions of one event as distinct events.²

There is also a mediæval Latin narrative of the return of Thomas à Becket to England, whose author, Roger of Hoveden,

¹ See "Tatian's *Diatessaron* and the Analysis of the Pentateuch," by Professor George F. Moore, D. D., *Journal of Bibl. Lit.* vol. ix. 1890, Part II.

² See art. "Livy" in *Encyc. Brit.*, 9th ed.

used two earlier works, one anonymous, the other by Benedict of Peterborough; but this last is based upon the anonymous one and another by John of Salisbury. Now all of these works exist, and the parts furnished by each writer can be shown in the last; and when they are represented by different kinds of type they present a page as speckled and ringstreaked as that of any higher critic's edition of Genesis.¹

The conclusion of the higher criticism, that we have in the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy, legislation of a later date than Moses given in his name, is very difficult for many to receive. At first blush it appears like a forgery or falsification. From an examination, however, of legal usages among other peoples we find that there need have been nothing of the sort; that the facts imply only the adoption of a common expedient to preserve the unity of law. Just as in Roman jurisprudence all law was supposed to be derived from the twelve tables, so apparently in Israel, because the primal fundamental law which gave shape to the holy people came from Moses, all subsequent law was supposed to be derived from him. To-day in India, when the government brings a new water-supply into a village, the rules regulating its use "do not purport to emanate from the personal authority of their author or authors; there is always a sort of fiction under which some customs as to the distribution of water are supposed to have existed from all antiquity, although, in fact, no artificial supply had been even so much as thought of."² Such expedients to preserve the unity of the law and bring it into harmony with society are called "legal fictions." Some have ridiculed them, and insist that they imply fraud. But says Sir Henry Maine, "To revile them as merely fraudulent is to betray ignorance of their peculiar office in the historical development of law." He also notes the fact that this expedient is historically the earliest of the agencies used to bring law into harmony with society, and adds, "At a particular stage of social progress they are invaluable expedients for overcoming the rigidity of the law, and, indeed, without one of them, the fiction of adoption, which permits the family tie to be artificially created, it is difficult to understand how society would ever have escaped from its swaddling-clothes, and taken its first step toward civilization."³ The

¹ See "A Mediæval Illustration of the Documentary Theory of the Origin of the Synoptic Gospels," by Rev. Charles Plummer, M. A., in *The Expositor*, vol. x. Third Series.

² Sir H. Maine's *Village Communities*, p. 110.

³ *Ancient Law*, pp. 24-26.

representation of a later legislation emanating from Moses does not necessarily prove deceit. It simply shows that the original code was kept open and adjusted, without destroying its unity, to the exigencies of later times.

And when later institutions were carried back to earlier times, as by the author of Chronicles, we may hold that it was done in good faith. Such reference is a natural habit, out of which we have no evidence that the Old Testament writers were lifted. They here followed apparently the views of their own time and of antiquity in general. "The Romans rejoiced in tracing all their characteristic institutions and customs, civil and religious, to some celebrated founder near the beginning of the state."¹ Thus the Old Testament was written, not from an antiquarian's point of view, but with a homiletical purpose; that of teaching not history nor science, but religion.

Next perhaps in interest to the question of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is that of the Isaianic authorship of the last twenty-seven chapters of the book of Isaiah. The conclusion of the higher criticism is that these chapters were not written by Isaiah. It is sometimes represented that this conclusion arises from "the determination that Isaiah must not be allowed to have predicted anything which happened long after his own time."² This is not true. The conclusion is reached by a simple, straightforward argument, such as is used in other literature, *with full allowance for the prophetic predictive element of the Old Testament*. The character of this element is first of all determined by an examination of prophecies whose genuineness is universally admitted. These, the undisputed writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, form a very considerable body of literature; and from these it is found that indications of time and authorship, as far as we can judge, are as clear in Old Testament prophecies as in other writings. They were addressed to contemporaries. They preserve the individual style and thought of their authors. Turning now to these chapters of Isaiah, we find that they are addressed to exiles in Babylonia; for they assume that Jerusalem has been destroyed (xliv. 26, lviii. 12, lxi. 4, lxiii. 18, lxiv. 10 f.), and that Israel is captive in Chaldæa (xlvi. 1-6, xlviii. 20, xliii. 14). These events are not predicted; they are the basis of the prediction

¹ Lewis's *Credibility of the Early Roman History*, p. 44.

² Bishop of Colchester, in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1892, p. 723.

of a future redemption through Cyrus, who is alluded to as one already known (xli. 1-3, 25, xlv. 28, xlv. 1, 13). Hence according to the analogy of other prophecy the date of these writings is the period of the exile, and they were not written by the prophet Isaiah of the days of Hezekiah. This result is further confirmed by differences in style and thought from the genuine prophecies of Isaiah. Here it is true that the argument is not so decisive, and there is much room for hypercriticism. Still, there are more indications of a diversity of authorship than of a unity. "The relation of Israel to Jehovah — its choice by him, its destiny, the purpose of its call — is developed in different terms and under different conceptions from those used by Isaiah: the figure of the Messianic king is absent (Is. ix. 6-7, xi. 1 ff.); the prophet associates his view of the future with a figure of a very different character, Jehovah's righteous servant (xlii. 1 ff. xlix. 1 ff. l. 4-9, lii. 13-14, li. 12, lxi. 1-3), which is closely connected with his own distinctive view of Israel's destiny. The divine purpose in relation to the nations, especially in connection with the prophetic mission of Israel, is more comprehensively developed. The prophet, in a word, in whatever elements of his teaching are distinctive moves in a *different region of thought* from Isaiah; he apprehends and emphasizes different aspects of divine truth."¹

In favor of the Isaianic authorship, it is true, there is the unbroken tradition of Jewish and Christian antiquity. But, as we have already intimated, such tradition is by no means decisive. The Jewish tradition embodied in the Old Testament is quite likely to be erroneous, as we know from the fact that certain Psalms are ascribed to David which, it is universally agreed, were not written by him. The Epistle of Barnabas has the unanimous testimony of the early church in favor of its genuineness, — testimony, also, given by those as scholarly as Clement of Alexandria and Origen within about one hundred years after its composition: but this testimony is freely granted to have been incorrect owing to internal evidence against it, evidence far less clear than in the case of Isaiah: for the upshot of it all is that "the epistle does not come up to the position and reputation of Barnabas the senior companion of Paul."² The tradition also in favor of the Isaianic authorship of these twenty-seven chapters we cannot trace earlier than the compilation or canonization of the prophetic books,

¹ Driver's *Literature of the Old Testament*, pp. 229 f.

² Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii. p. 676.

which may not have taken place before the beginning of the second century,¹ five hundred years after the time of Isaiah, and cannot have been earlier than the close of the fifth century, three hundred years after the time of Isaiah. Hence, there is every reason to allow that the tradition may have been incorrect. Later Jewish opinion upon such matters frequently was not based upon historic testimony, but arose from fanciful conjecture. In the Talmud Psalms are assigned to Adam, Melchisedek, and Abraham. In the fourth book of Esdras, a Jewish work of the close of the first century, A. D., the Law, that is, the Pentateuch, is represented as having been lost (burnt) at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, and then miraculously revealed to Ezra. This story was accepted as true by many church fathers.²

The illustrations and comparisons which we have presented do not, of course, prove that the conclusions of Old Testament Higher Criticism are correct. They simply show that this criticism is the application of a method of knowledge, valid in other literature, and that its results correspond to other literary conclusions and phenomena.

The higher criticism has not yet fulfilled its mission in respect to the Old Testament. Its work thus far has been predominantly negative or destructive; much that is constructive still remains to be done. When that has been accomplished, the evangelical church will find many of her old conceptions respecting this portion of the Word of God firmly established. Old Testament history in outline will have been found to be correct. Moses will still remain the great lawgiver of Israel. His epoch will be shown to have been a creative one. The parallel between him and Christ will stand. The order, the law and the prophets, will not have been entirely reversed. The Messianic promises will have been in no way changed. The Old Testament will still contain an integral part of the Word of God: a word not found in an infallible record of historical or scientific facts, but in that of a revelation of divine love: a revelation given among the nations of the earth to Israel alone, and culminating in our Lord and Redeemer Jesus of Nazareth.

Edward Lewis Curtis.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

¹ Buhl's *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, sec. 4.

² See Ryle's *Canon of the Old Testament*, Excursus A.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S AUTHORITY AS A
LAWGIVER.

A STUDY of the method of our Saviour, especially in his Sermon on the Mount, and of the reasons, so far as we can define them, why we receive those teachings as the law of our spiritual life, suggests some interesting considerations as to the nature of that authority which in Jesus we call divine. This study brings to light a significant analogy between what is called revealed truth and certain other classes of ideas which, though created outright by the human faculties, we nevertheless receive as established knowledge. It indicates that the teaching which we call supernatural in origin may, nevertheless, be but the higher natural into which we grow by kinship with the Son of God, authenticating itself to us by what we have in common with it. Let us examine the words which describe the impression made by Jesus on this occasion, together with the whole complexion of the discourse and its grasp, as we feel it, upon our moral nature.

"He taught them as one having authority." The authority meant is the authority of a lawgiver or commander. The Teacher impressed his audience as one who was conscious of a moral kingship and right to be obeyed. He stood as it were at the very source from which obligation proceeds. He does not speak as if his authority to command were derived from any outside source; He does not refer his auditors to the means for authenticating his utterances. It is as if the words which He spoke were finally true and compelling.

In studying the nature of religious authority we do well to fix our attention on it at this point. Here the authority is ultimate. This is the point towards which the present worth of all Scripture converges. As a progressive revelation its moral value and dignity at any point authenticates itself in proportion as it is in harmony with the clear utterances of Christ. The bright anticipations of Messianic seers look forward to the final truth in Him; the consecrated wisdom of apostles draws its validity from the spirit of the Lord. We reckon an age in Bible history advanced and enlightened, or an inspired book high in spiritual rank, in proportion to what it contains of the mind of Christ. But here we see that mind disclosing itself directly. Here it is the Son of God who speaks, and He speaks ethically. He tells us plainly what we ought to be and do. If in other parts of Scripture,

speaking, as they do, in narrative, in personal aspiration, in puzzled debate, in political admonition, we often have to distill ethical suggestion for our lives from their words by inference, we may know that here is the ultimate authoritative teaching by which the validity of all such inference is gauged. The main value of Scripture to us is as a rule of faith and practice. But whereas in most parts of the Bible we have to transform the history, psalm, or prophecy into a rule by our own interpretative power in judging of its applicability to our conduct, here the preceptive authority is direct and final. One who speaks with authority tells us our duty. In studying authority at this point we are not concerning ourselves with questions of authorship or authenticity, of historical or scientific exactness; we are simply considering that which Scripture exists to teach, if anything, — our own duty, or the nature of true righteousness. Here, then, is the point at which to ascertain the nature and validity of religious authority.

Let us, then, observe the method of the divine Teacher. At the outset we must endeavor to divest ourselves of the prepossessions which we have inherited from centuries of religious history and worship, and assume in imagination the attitude of this audience on the slopes of the mountain towards the wonderful Galilean. To us a word from the Master is the end of controversy, because we accept Him as divine. His heavenly rank is taken without question as authenticating his truth. But to the people who listened to his words this presupposition is not present. They have, it is true, heard of his wonderful works, and many reverence Him as a prophet; but there is no such putting forward of divine claims as to make the burden of authority rest on the person or rank of the Teacher. In fact, we note an absence of personal assertion or display of credentials. He has no occasion to begin by explaining who He is. While He contrasts himself, and so makes himself of equal rank, with the teachers of old time, by his majestic "But I say unto you," He is nevertheless not calling upon his hearers to believe because He says it, but because his message is true.

And this is the true way to teach moral doctrine, even when it is proclaimed as by authority. People must gain an ownership of the truth, rather than be silenced by awe of the promulgator. When Elihu, with his arrogant confidence in his own knowledge, professes to be the truth-revealing daysman for whom Job wished in his perplexity, he says: —

"Behold *my* terror shall not make thee afraid,
Neither shall *my* pressure be heavy upon thee."

So likewise Jesus, the eternal Daysman, does not begin by establishing a claim. There is no making prominent, just now, of fulfillments of prophecy; there is no resting on the indorsement of those who decide on the claims of new prophets. In this discourse Jesus does not even appeal to his mighty works. There will no doubt be occasion for all these means of maintaining his standing when other exigencies are to be met. But here He simply opens his mouth and teaches. To the multitude He is nothing more nor less than a new teacher, and the power of his teaching to rule them is to be established by its own worthiness of acceptance. His words shall stand by the strength of their own inherent truthfulness. For the present purpose it matters not who the speaker is; let the truth appear with no terror of his to make men afraid. The final test of its authority is in itself.

Truth which thus stands in its own strength is not careful to borrow cogency from logic. Indeed its authority is not made stronger by any process of reasoning. As we consider this fact, we are prepared to understand another characteristic of the Saviour's method. He does not argue; He proclaims. He does not prove; He asserts. He deals in truth, rather than in what is called thought. It is truth which He sees, and which every soul to whom it comes will see as soon as that soul is honest with itself.

We sometimes have the impression that a thing is truer for having behind it a well-linked process of argument. Those truths seem to us the solidest which are most securely buttressed by reasoned proofs. He is thought the strongest in the faith who is the mightiest in defending it by logic; and that man's vision of God seems the clearest whose knowledge of Him has had to go through the most careful and laborious process of establishing itself. But this is not always so. We certainly do well to heed a truth which has been established by careful reasoning; but it is not the reasoning which has made it true. Reasoning is only the process by which it is communicated to us. It is the way of making truth common property. There stands the truth, created by God, eternally the same, and never to pass away. Some of that truth, owing to our defective insight, we discover only by means of other truths which lead up to it; and so by putting this and that together we come to see it by means of our logical ability. But while reason is in one sense our power and our pride, from another point of view the necessity of reasoning is a mark of our imperfection. God does not reason; He sees. He does not have

to infer one truth from another; it all lies open before Him. That we should have to arrive at truth by laborious processes of inference and generalization, is a mark of our finiteness and imperfection.

Facts or principles that can be made common by reasoning are not the highest kind of truth. There are truths which come to light only in the direct converse of the soul with eternal reality. The obedient heart sees them directly, and the only thing it can do to establish them is to commit itself to them and transmute them into living experience. Of this character are the distinctive truths of Christ's Sermon on the Mount. The main thing we have to do in order to enable men to receive them, is to awaken their spirits. The mists to be cleared away are not the obscurities of imperfect logic, but the fumes of unsanctified affection and selfish will. Sinful men are indeed blinded to the truths of the Kingdom, but this is not because they are such poor reasoners; it is because sin blinds their eyes. The prophets of God are not occupied with proving divine truths; they are only set to proclaim them in the strength of the Lord God, and to bring men into obedience to their commands. When men's hearts are in the right attitude toward God they will see, and not till then.

Now truths that are directly seen are none the less truths because a visible process of reasoning is not wrought into them. They are all the more important and exalted for their very simplicity of self-evidencing power. But such knowledge does not appear valid to others, except through the same process of personal intuition. The fact is, the highest truth is not completely verifiable by mere logic. It must be accepted by faith. To verify or prove a thing is to find something else that is of the same rank, or several things of the same rank, from which that truth is inferred. Our science is but generalized truth founded on the facts of experience. The facts become wonderful when they are put together and an inference is made from them. The truth that is inferred, that is, the generalized truth, often seems a higher truth than the facts from which it was derived. But it is not really a truth of higher rank; it is only a broader truth. If it were a higher truth than was included in the separate facts, the inference would not be a legitimate one. It is granted that by the scientific method men infer higher truths from the facts of existence; but it is really because their intuition and their faith have supplied the missing links. Every process of induction, as every logician well knows, includes a logical leap which is strictly

not authorized. The separate facts that make up the inferred truth cannot all be known, but enough are observed to make the general rule probable. To call it demonstrated truth, however, requires some assumption that is brought in by our faith.

To prove a thing, then, is to find other things of the same rank which include that thing. Now there are truths which rise above all equality of rank with the common facts of life. Anything which we have ever seen, and to which we can point as indisputable in our daily life, is only a lower truth which does not strictly include them. At the best, our experience can only point toward them, never absolutely prove them. To look down upon a mountain peak we must climb some other elevation which is at least as high. The highest overtowering elevation of all can never be commanded from the peaks around. In like manner the highest truths are incommunicable by reasoning. They must be seen and known directly. There is nothing in our ordinary earthly life to include and command them.

These words of the Sermon on the Mount are of this order of truth. They stand in the strength of their own self-evidencing power. Let them once be clearly seen and proclaimed, and the hearer who is honest and obedient in heart knows them to be so. Christ, therefore, simply proclaims; He does not reason them out. He appeals to the conscience of each one who hears Him, and He knows that sooner or later all will agree with Him.

The truth to which He brings our conscience here in this discourse, then, is truth such as we have enough kinship with Him to recognize when it is pointed out to us. In proportion as we enter into the relation of obedient sons of God we may see it. We are not to acknowledge without seeing, and merely because He is in authority and has said it; we may see and know for ourselves when it is once pointed out to us. This is the kind of authority by which He speaks. It is authority proceeding from God, but it has the indorsement of all that is most like God in ourselves.

It has been already noticed that the authority mentioned in the text with which we started out is the authority of a lawgiver or commander, that is, imperative authority. But it is no serious aberration of thought to make this practically the same as the authority of a witness, — that is, credibility. It is this latter quality which is almost always meant when people in these days speak of that much sought-for thing, religious authority. In inquiring for its nature and source they generally mean, "Who can tell us

ultimate truth? Whose *ipse dixit* is the end of controversy and of independent judgment?" rather than, "What edicts are ultimately imperative for our soul?" The fact is, the ultimate edicts of our Infinite King, when they are discovered, are not found to be infinitely arbitrary and outside of us, but intimately blended with our own nature, — the very law of our being. A man's inmost soul has not bowed to authority so long as it is to him arbitrary and altogether *ab extra*; that word of command must be to him an expression of his highest end, or his conduct in obedience to it is not of real ethical value. He who commands most truly, therefore, is he who testifies most clearly of the nature of the truest manhood; he is really a witness to the facts of our highest selves. It is, therefore, as a witness that Jesus speaks, even when uttering the words of a lawgiver.

But it should be noticed that He is a peculiar kind of witness. He is a witness who derives confirmation from our assent. A common eye-witness to a simple matter of fact is ultimate authority, because he testifies to matters beyond our observation, and which we have no means of verifying or disputing. But Christ speaks as witness to an inward truth which our conscience can and must verify when we attain to the point of view for it. He does not reason, for the truth in question is unverifiable by dialectic processes; but He offers us the means of attaining to that spiritual elevation where we may see for ourselves.¹ For this reason, as it seems to me, the method which has sometimes been adopted of figuring to our mind the nature of Christ's

¹ In discussing his authority, as the Saviour repeatedly does in John's Gospel, He calls himself a witness (John iii. 11), and professes to conform to the Mosaic law of testimony (viii. 17; cf. Deut. xvii. 6), because He has confirmation; but this confirmation is greater than the testimony of John (v. 33, 34), or indeed any human testimony; and while confirmatory testimony exists in the Scriptures, yet this may fail to be convincing to those who search them in the wrong spirit (v. 39, 40). He says that the works which the Father has given Him to do bear witness of Him, and are indeed of greater value than John's testimony (v. 36; x. 37), and yet these very works, as miraculous signs, failed to carry conviction to the minds of those for whom they were intended, because of judicial blindness (xii. 37, *sq.*). The final confirmation is the Father who has sent Him (v. 37; cf. vi. 44), and the power to see that confirmation results from being born again (iii. 3), from the Father's word (v. 38), or the word of Jesus himself (viii. 37, 43) abiding in the believer, from being his sheep (x. 26, 27), or from the spirit of obedience (vii. 17). All of which implies that Christ's words as a witness are finally authenticated by a spiritual insight or susceptibility in the hearer, which is as the voice of God, and to which all may attain by obedient faith.

claims to be the world's teacher is somewhat beside the mark. He has been treated purely as a witness to an outside fact. The method has been to examine his credibility apart from the contents of his testimony, that is, to establish his character as supernatural by means of his miracles, and then to rest the truth of his message on his competence, thus ascertained, to speak of things beyond our sphere. But in fact we are to take Him and his message together; we are to judge by independent sanctified judgment of the worthiness of his doctrine to be received as divine truth. Not simply that He is supernatural, and therefore speaks the truth, but that He *is* the truth; He is the very Word of God made flesh. So closely is He identified with the truth, that in authenticating his word we almost seem to reason in a circle,—He is divine because He speaks the truth, and He speaks the truth because He is the Son of God. He is a witness, but He is a witness to that which belongs to the highest human nature, to all spiritual existence which is one; and we may become so elevated and normal in our perceptions that we shall be of that higher spirit, and all that is within us shall rise up and indorse his doctrine.

Do not think that you are doing dishonor to God in trying to see his truth for yourself. Do not think that the only reverent attitude toward God is the attitude of dumb, unreasoning submission. Our reason was given us to use. Our reason has not acquiesced nor really believed until it has come to see for itself. We do honor to the truth by searching it out, and satisfying our reason. If we simply say, "This statement seems absurd to my human understanding, but I crucify reason and believe by sheer exercise of will,"—this is not our reason acquiescing; it is our reason silenced. But Christ would have us know, by the higher intuitive knowledge, that which He knows. He would bring us into a fellowship with Him. He says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself." We may not have earthly facts at our disposal which shall prove the high truths of his kingdom, but we have a kinship with the Son of God, by which we may be made to see them. If we are of God, as Jesus elsewhere expresses it, we hear God's words. To believe in Christ, then, in its highest sense, is to be in that state of obedience to God in which we shall see that He is the truth. We do not imply doubt or irreverence when we insist on seeing it for ourselves. We honor the truth in this way; for until we have seen it, we

have not given it a sway over our hearts. To embrace it is quite a different thing from being silenced before it.

Yet it is as one having authority that Jesus teaches. Not an arbitrarily exercised authority, as we have seen, but a natural authority, an authority which manifests its reality by compelling assent. Let it be observed that such deriving of power from the assent of the hearer is still authority. To insist on seeing and knowing the truth for ourselves is not to say there is no such thing as authority, that we ourselves are the final deciders of the truth. It is not to say that the Lord's authoritative teaching was not necessary, that we should have found it all out ourselves if we had been left alone. Blunted as are our spiritual perceptions, we could not have originated that revelation of God's will, even though we can and must give it practical validity by recognizing it when it comes. The One who originally sees and utters it for us is an authority to whose word we must defer by finding its reasonableness.

It is by authority that the highest kind of truth is propagated. There is always a place for religious authority in the world, however intelligent and rational the human race may become. The nature of the highest truth is such that only the purest, most inspired souls perceive it originally, and these not by dialectic skill, but by insight and self-devotion. These become prophets, and proclaim that truth for others, who in turn see it as they become spiritually developed to its level. It is truth which belongs to the higher man created in us by the Spirit, — truth which becomes truth only as that higher man comes into existence. It is not surprising that mere experience on the world's level should not find it out. He who by inspiration of the Spirit lives the life of that higher man proclaims it; he who catches a glimpse of that higher self by obedience of heart assents to it. The Saviour, who is the inspirer, — who is that higher man in complete oneness with the Eternal truth, — is the perfect exponent of truth, the Word of God. Because that truth belongs to the humanity that is coming to be, rather than to that which is, therefore the fore-sharers of that spiritual humanity are the authorities for the world.

The contrast to such authority which insists on suggesting itself to our mind is the contrast of science. Religion and science are often thought of as opposite in their nature; but the difference which is felt to exist is owing, not to the fact that the one is science, or ordered knowledge, while the other is not, but to the

difference in the subject-matter in each case. There is a science of morals and of religion, because there are subjective facts in the movement of our conscience and spirit which admit of being classified and presented as ordered knowledge. But it is worth our while to notice the difference between a science of what ought to be and a science of what is actually observable. Religious or ethical knowledge concerns itself with what ought to be, or is coming to be in our higher selves. It is the science of that which does not exist, except as humanity creates it by sonship to God. The circle of truth thus created constitutes the laws of a new humanity. Yet these laws are not arbitrary, nor out of harmony with the laws of our common life. The new man is the realization of all manhood in its true meaning, and his laws are laws to which we all owe allegiance. If we are candid, we see this. Thus, while this truth has power to compel assent from the candid and obedient everywhere, the original possession and custody of it remains with those who have become new men in the Spirit. It must therefore always be propagated by authority. Jesus Christ and those inspired men who derive truth from his Spirit will always remain the centre of the world's light.

Religious truth has its parallel in the truths of æsthetical science, which may be taken to illustrate it. Let us take, for example, the science and the art of music. In this we find laws of harmony and of form which are authoritative. It is a science, but it is the science of an art. That which those laws regulate is a pure creation of the soul of man. There is nothing in nature like the harmonies which genius has created; no analogy of birds or thunder-tones has sufficed to teach them to the soul. But no genius can create arbitrarily. These harmonies and measured sequences seem like the deepest and truest voice of nature; we call them excellent in proportion as they appear to be the spontaneous expression of pure emotion. Some higher æsthetic man in us assents to them, while we could not have originated them in our duller brains. The entrancing emotional movement of the symphony is the natural voice of some man who was created by genius and culture.

The author of these artistic creations has not simply willed something of his own arbitrary impulse; he has listened obediently to an inner voice. He has not only succeeded in giving expression to our highest emotional nature, but he is found by students of acoustics to have been working in obedience to certain well-defined mathematical laws; and these students sometimes fancy that in

their mechanical experimenting with sirens and monochords they have discovered the secret of his creative skill; just as the expounders of theories of morals imagine that the creative secret of ethics and religion is found by statistical analysis of human practice. But dissection can work only upon the dead cadaver; and the laws of musical science or of religious conduct are laws of life that can be followed only by an active sympathy with the living movement far different from that dry curiosity which subjects the lifeless framework of artistic fact to mechanical analysis.

In musical art the canons of such higher emotional expression were derived by induction from works which were taken as authoritative standards. A musical genius who creates great works of art becomes an authority, and inspires a school of followers. He acquires the skill and the learning of his time, and this gives him a voice by which to express himself. But it is that which is creative in him, that which he has derived from direct sympathy with higher nature, which is his distinction, and which makes him an authority for the future. He may often seem to traverse the laws already laid down; he may have to wait in poverty for posterity to accept his work. He cannot prove that his creation is according to true laws: in fact, men must grow up to the appreciation of his work before they find laws underlying it which compel their allegiance. In his music he speaks forth his spirit, and he needs a like spirit to appreciate him. But if he is a true child of nature, a true genius, he becomes in time an authority, and men derive rules of the art from him. By winning the assent of like spirits, he rules as their inspirer; nor do these deny his authority when they insist on seeing his beauties with independent judgment for themselves.

This kind of truth, as we see, propagates itself in a different way from that in which physical science is taught. Science is democratic. The facts and proofs are put in the possession of all, and if they are not satisfied with their teacher's generalizations, they may exercise their own reasoning powers upon the body of truth that is made common. In this higher truth, on the contrary, men must reach a certain elevation before they perceive the facts. Those who learn are put in the way to stand where the genius stood, and see with his eyes. He cannot demonstrate the validity of his laws; he can only offer his disciples the possibility of a fellowship with him. Ruskin says: "For, indeed, the arts, as regards teachableness, differ from the sciences also in this, that their power is founded not merely on facts which can be communicated, but on dispositions which require to be created. Art is neither to

be achieved by effort of thinking, nor explained by accuracy of speaking." Yet the canons of art are just as certain as if they were derived by induction from commonly observed physical facts.

The analogy of all this with what is called revealed truth readily suggests itself. And we may carry it still farther. It often happens, in musical or other fine art, that those who by training and without creative genius have put themselves in the way of understanding and interpreting works of art become themselves authorities in artistic learning. They are the Scribes of art. They establish a reign, not of insight, but of pedantry. They make authority too arbitrary. In pinning themselves to precedents they lose sight of nature. They do not encourage independent expression of beauty, they only establish slavery to the past. They are the foes of budding genius, just as the scribes in the religious realm persecute the prophets. Then by and by a genius comes, who, after mastering the artistic learning of his time, breaks loose from the bondage of pedantry, which artificially cramps his individuality, and comes back to nature. He establishes new canons of taste by his own power to see and proclaim æsthetic truth. After his novitiate of tribulation and difficulty, he becomes a new authority in his turn.

Truth of this order, then, is advanced by authority. That is to say, it is in a sense revealed. Its prophets rule by virtue of genius, or kinship with higher nature. One genius does not always remain supreme. As his truth becomes the commonplace of one generation, some one arises in the next who takes his place as the transcendent prophet of beauty. But the genius who is outgrown, be it observed, is not thenceforth shown to have been a false teacher. His message was true for his time, even though it may seem outgrown and defective in the light of subsequent knowledge. Being truth, as we have seen, only by virtue of a certain relation established with the mind created to receive it, a given expression of nature may come to be so out of touch with a succeeding age as to be no longer of living interest. It seems rudimentary and trite by the side of the later achievements which had the advantage of the earlier prophet's work as a stepping-stone. There is thus a progress in such truth or science, because its data are progressively created, and it dawns on the world as men gradually rise to the level of perceiving it. But its progress is not such as denies its own past; it only incorporates from its past whatever is worthy to live among the easy commonplaces of its knowledge, while its fresher and more absorbing interest reaches after newer things.

"Thoughts that great hearts once broke for, we
 Breathe cheaply in the common air ;
 The dust we trample heedlessly
 Throbbled once in saints and heroes rare,
 Who perished, opening for their race
 New pathways to the commonplace."

The history of revelation has proceeded by a similar development and progress. Revealed truth is simply the progressively dawning faith of the sons of God. It is by authority that it naturally propagates itself. Those who in insight and character stand nearest to the mind of God, are those who see and proclaim it. These are the inspired men who of old spake as they were borne along by the Holy Ghost. But while in matters of taste no final and supreme authority has been found whose greatness shall never be superseded, in the realm of religious truth the perfect Son of God has come to show us the Father and make us joint heirs with Him. He has revealed and embodied the truth once for all ; and our advance in truth is simply coming to be truly at one with Him. His authority therefore is final, but it is not arbitrary ; for it is the authority of our own higher nature, our own restored spiritual sanity. He does not prove ; he does not carry our mind through inductive processes. Such processes would do us no good ; for the thing he would have us see does not exist for us until it is created in us. But by fellowship in his divinely filial spirit we may see and know. We do not discredit his perfect inspiration when we ask to see for ourselves. We do not detract from his authority when we say it derives its practical validity from our assent. That very assent is the awakening of our higher life. That assent, encouraged and made a condition in the complete process of revelation, puts his teaching in the greatest contrast to that of the Scribes ; for these, as the slaves of and enslavers to authority, crushed out all independence, and left unevoked that higher appreciation which alone could make spiritual authority valid.

Ethical truth, as revealed through authority, is therefore in its nature like æsthetic truth, rather than like the truths of natural science. Just as right living is essentially a fine art — that is, something which man creatively adds to unschooled nature, and yet which is really nature realizing herself — so the laws of right living were revealed through those pure souls who saw by obedient insight the unity of all spiritual law, and became authorities for those who were admitted by faith to fellowship with them. But this authority, whether of artistic genius, or of religiously inspired

prophet, or of Son of Man himself, is not an absolute quelling of thought or independence. It is a testifying to what is in man. The artist's or the seer's utterances, once proclaimed, reveal to the disciple types of beauty or moral excellence which he is to apprehend, through their guidance, for himself, and by whose light he may even turn about and criticise his teacher's work. Such criticism, coming to see and embrace the type, and so disclosing the reasonableness of faith, lies at the very heart of assent, and insures its sincerity and genuineness.

G. F. Genung.

SUFFIELD, CONNECTICUT.

MISSIONS AND CIVILIZATION.

III.

WE have considered the relation of the gospel to elaborate heathen civilizations, like those of China or India; and also to that rude, inorganic state of society which prevails almost everywhere within the domain of Islam, and which all its injunctions presuppose. We have now to consider the gospel in its relations to unmistakably barbarous tribes, like those of the Negroes and Bantu Negroids of Africa, or even to savage tribes, like those of the northern American Indians.

What is the business of the missionary on arriving among a barbarous tribe, whether one already touching a rude civilization, or positively savage, that is, living only by fishing and the chase? To this there can be but one answer: The one essential duty of the missionary, whether he comes to the ample civilization of China or Japan or India, or to the utter rudeness of the Pawnee or Comanche, is to bring the one message, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. His one end is to obtain the acceptance of this message in faith and love, as the controlling principle of life. If he comes for any other end, he may come on a perfectly legitimate and useful errand, but he is not a missionary of Christ. If he divides his time between this message and something else, however admissible in itself, to which he is not impelled by the earnest desire to gain acceptance for it (external necessity apart), he falls under the Apostle's condemnation, as one that is suffering himself to be entangled in the affairs of this life.

There is, however, a narrow and illiberal, and there is a broad and liberal way of construing a missionary's duty. "Broad" and "liberal" are dangerous terms to use here, and it is no wonder that many devoted Christians are suspicious of them. They have reason for suspicion. Under their mantle a great deal of lazy self-indulgence shelters itself, and a great many other aims than the simplicity of Christ. Yet for all this there is a genuinely broad and liberal and there is a really narrow and unenlightened way of apprehending this work. What is the distinction between them?

It may be defined thus. The narrow way begins, proceeds, and ends with the immediately religious life, and with the exclusively, often ostentatiously, religious expression of it. The broad and liberal way, equally with the other, begins in the religious centre of life, that centre in which all men are equal, indeed identical, not numerically, but in essence, in which the soul is apprehended of God. It brings to each soul of man, in this its inmost shrine, the image of Jesus Christ as the true form of God. It presents Him as incarnate, living among his brethren in the exercise of all gracious deeds, dying for them, conquering death in the resurrection for himself and them, ascending glorified, and for himself and them partaking of the power and glory of the Father forever. If he bring any other message, he may be a very amiable and worthy man, but he is not a Christian missionary.

Now this message may be presented in such a way as that, while it ever abides in the heart and is a fountain of everdeepening religious life, it does not remain confined there, but expands into all the ethical instincts and relations of the man, and into all his æsthetic sensibilities, into all the ramifications of his spiritual, intellectual, and physical being. So presented, it is preached in a *liberal* way, that is, in a way which leads to the true liberty of the children of God. As by leading the soul to an acceptance of Him who is the Well-beloved of the Father, and establishing it in an indissoluble union with Him, it relieves it of the interior sense of condemnation, and confirms it in the certainty of attaining the eternal end of its creation, so in and with this consciousness it frees it of all exterior servitude, and both encourages and impels it to perfect itself in the image of the Elder Brother, as being now, by adoption, the freeborn child and heir. It stimulates it, in the reception of uninterrupted help from the Redeemer, and from the Father through Him, to

strenuous and continuing rectification of all its powers from the distortion of sin, to the cleansing of them from the defilement of sin, and to the full development of them from embryonic imperfection. It plainly cannot stop with the individual, for the conception of the soul as capable of perfection in moral isolation, though long surviving in the Christian Fathers, and perhaps not yet overcome in Roman Catholic theology, is fundamentally pagan. Therefore the missionary will never account his work done until he has developed to the consciousness of his converts the Christian ideal of all the essential directions of the human powers, in the individual, the social, and ultimately even the political life, in such a measure as to afford a reasonable assurance that the national pastorate into whose hands his work is to pass over will be competent to carry on his work in all its lines to perfection, and will have a due sense of the importance of neglecting no part of it. If his work begins and ends with the individual soul, he is a pagan sage, and not even a pagan sage of the higher level. If his message begins and ends, as his Master's did, with inducing men to prepare themselves for the Regeneration, for the coming of the kingdom of God, in all the amplitude of its celestial meanings, he is a messenger of his Master.

This statement, tried by the example of Paul, is fully confirmed. He began in Corinth with determining to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. Assuredly he never departed from this determination. Yet the two epistles to the Corinthians of themselves show us in what largeness he conceived and applied it; and, as Professor Sabatier has so admirably shown, the advancing series of his letters demonstrates how his apprehension of the Christian value of the ethical relations of life continually widened, until, writing to the Philippians, he exhorts them, as an essential part of the gospel which he has preached, to study the theory and fulfill the practice of "*whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honorable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report,*" in short, to follow after theory and practice of every virtuous and every laudable thing. Everything, even to the pure tinting of the pure picture of a pure artist, is evidently included, and meant to be included, within the sweep and scope of this apostolic exhortation. It is but a translation of St. Paul, when St. Francis de Sales says that a soul abiding in God may turn every act of the day into a sacrament, as the Apostle himself translates into explicit language

Zechariah's prophecy of the time when the bells of the horses should have the sanctity which had hitherto been reserved for the high priest's mitre. It has lately been noted, by an eminent missionary and theological teacher, as a dangerous sign in Andover and New Haven and Bangor, that their teachers are greatly interested in all that adds dignity and beauty to life. If he means that they are endeavoring to embellish life with the beauty and dignity of a pagan renaissance, he slanders them even beyond his common wont of religious calumny. If he means that they are greatly interested in giving to life those last refinements of beauty and dignity which proceeded from the ultimate delicacy of regenerate discernment, he is simply saying that they are disciples of St. Paul, and are continuing the preaching of his gospel, and are, as Dr. Storrs has admirably described even the impracticable ideals of the great mediæval teachers, endeavoring to prepare on earth a tabernacle fit to enshrine the Lord of glory.

But how, it may be asked, can any sincere and instructed Christian man preach the gospel in any other way? It is a wonder how any can, but the unhappy fact is, that some do. There are men at home, and men abroad, to whom, by a spiritual rather than mental imbecility, the preaching of the gospel, notwithstanding their personal piety and Christian experience, incarnates itself in a few rudimentary formulas, which they are incessantly iterating, with the least possible variety of expression or extension of application. These formulas are sometimes texts of Scripture and sometimes statements of theology, but, one or the other, they are so treated as to present to the hearer, not the living Christ, but abstract conceptions of Him, bearing no more vital relation to himself than the descriptions of a botany bear to the living plant, for even the preparations of an herbarium are nearer to that than many of these statements are to Him. Indeed, it can hardly be said that such men even wish to bring near to the soul a living sense of the Redeemer, of his power, his goodness, his glory. What they preach is not so much Christ as a certain algebraic x which they call Christ, the acceptance of which is to deliver the soul from a juridical condemnation into a juridical justification, and ultimately into a formal salvation as empty of all the graciousness of life, terrestrial or celestial, as all the rest of their scheme. Those deep and strong foundations of Christian thought which we admire in the great theologies, in Aquinas and Calvin, in Westminster and Wittenberg, are not to them the skeleton of a living body, but a skeleton which it is a ground of suspicion if any one

endeavors to invest with the beauty and flexible warmth of flesh and blood. As we once heard Dr. Muhlenberg say, when a noted pastor of New York had died: "Dr. So-and-So was a good Christian man, and a good friend of mine; but what a mechanical notion he had of preaching the gospel! For forty years he rattled the same old bones over and over and over again in his pulpit, and at the end he called upon his people — in childlike unconsciousness that he was not speaking altogether in the spirit of St. Paul — to bear witness that he had determined to know nothing among them save Jesus Christ and Him crucified! He sincerely endeavored to incorporate the gospel into his life, and in that way, doubtless, preached it among his people; but as he presented it from the pulpit, it was but the holding out of a fetich for unintelligent adoration, or the iteration of a magical formula, which, by some inexplicable divine decree, is supposed to be invested with regenerating efficacy for all those that do not — in Catholic phrase — interpose a willful *obex* against its operation."

Now good men of this sort can no more be restrained from going abroad than they can be kept out of the pulpits at home, nor is it altogether desirable that they should. They are often as consecrated in spirit, as ready to spend and be spent for the Redeemer and his cause as men whose intelligence of both is deeper. They preach the gospel by their lives, however wooden may be their statements of it. Nevertheless, it were much to be wished that their preaching of it also were more vital. They differ in nothing essential from those worthy friars, often deeply consecrated men, who, having baptized their Indians or negroes, are very complacent if these have learned to rattle off glibly the "Credo" and "Ave Maria" and "Pater Noster," and have learned a few pretty and very sentimental stories about the saints, and have given up polygamy and a few of the more obvious heathen vices. The Protestants, it is true, are commonly provided with wives, whose more flexible female minds are less fettered by formulas, and live more in the heart of things, and they translate hymns which have a deeper Christian thought and experience than the mawkish ditties of modern Roman Catholicism, while this, on the other hand, is more likely to convey to its converts the depth and grandeur of such hymns as the "Te Deum" and the "Gloria in Excelsis." But, above all, the Protestant, be he as wooden and mechanical as he may, is always solicitous to provide his people with the Holy Scriptures, and first of all with the Gospels. It is impossible, therefore, but that he should give to his converts much stronger

and much more various impulses upwards, both religious, ethical, and intellectual, than a Catholic of the same inferior type would give to his.

I have described this character in its baldest form, for the sake of clearness. Even in a more mitigated and tolerable shape, I believe it to be much more decidedly the exception abroad than at home. The missionary life educates with great force to central simplicity of apprehension, and to the presentation of the personal Christ. Missionaries have often expressed it as a happy thing that the languages which they have to handle, especially the yet uncultivated tongues, do not lend themselves easily to the hard formulas of abstract theology, and that they have small time to hunt out such capacities for this as these languages may chance to possess. The grossness and manifoldness of heathen vice, moreover, with its undisguisedness in barbarous tribes, arouses all the ethical sensibilities and energies of the missionary, and impels him to chastise wickedness and encourage goodness in his converts without too curious a care to deduce everything in due logical order from the elaborately stated principle of Justification by Faith. If he is a good man and true, Christ is in him as the example of goodness, the hope of glory, and already, in measure, as the Judge of the world, and the emergencies of his work drive him to speak words of graciousness, of comfort, or of terror, according to present need, leaving their doctrinal relations to be settled afterwards. The missionary work, and above all the missionary work among rude peoples, is confessedly one of the most powerful simplifiers of the home theologies. It helps to drive out of them everything that has turned to chaff, while it has no tendency to emasculate them into superficiality.

Still, there will always remain, at home and abroad, the comparatively narrow and the comparatively broad type of preacher; and as both are plainly marked in native character, both are, without question, indispensably serviceable. The prevalingly religious type is jealous of too large and various a range of missionary activities, lest they should lose the centre out of sight. This, indeed, is a real danger. In the rationalistic era it was the death of several flourishing missions. On the other hand, there is the broad, ethical, society-building type, which frets over the suspicions entertained by the former style of character of all efforts for the good of a heathen people which do not bear the immediate imprint of devotion. It is much to be desired that a mission should have both sorts of men, but on the whole it seems prefer-

able that the preponderatingly religious type should prevail. The religious consciousness and centre of any heathen people is that which first needs to be regenerated. From this heart of the man are the issues of life. His apprehensions of God need to be delivered, through Christ, from the thralldom of terror, to be purified from the defilements of evil, to be elevated from the depression of servility. Therefore the direct cultivation of the devotional life, especially of rude converts, who cannot as yet do much for themselves, ought to engage for a good while a large part, perhaps the larger part, of the missionary's attention. Besides, Protestantism is so essentially ethical that a Protestant worker abroad cannot, if he would, avoid preaching a gospel which bears on the life as well as the feelings.

We must distinguish, therefore, between the missionary and the mission. If there is but one worker, devoutness should be the main part of his character. The greater variety of practical faculties he adds to this, coming among a barbarous people, like Bishop Patteson or Alexander Mackay, the better. But these are secondary; spiritual proficiency is primary. A mission to a barbarous people, however, most decidedly ought to comprehend a variety of talents. All belonging to it ought to be approved and thorough Christians, but it is by no means necessary that all should be especially skillful in dealing with the individual religious life. A mission ought to come as a general expression of beneficence and power, in their various forms, from a higher sphere, as Christ came. Each member of such a body is a missionary of Christ, because the fundamental purpose which has brought each one is, that the preaching of Christ may be accepted more readily, and because each one is ready to do his part of the immediate religious work, according to his capacity. Of course, no one disputes the importance of the medical missionary, both on account of his value to the mission itself, and on account of his obvious correspondence with the left hand of our Lord's redeeming activity, his healing power.

In the full ideal of a mission in uncivilized lands, there would doubtless be included men who should not so much be missionaries to the people as missionaries to the missionaries, helpers to them, for the sustaining of their spiritual and intellectual life, which, among barbarous heathen, it is so hard for them to sustain, and the flagging of which renders them so much the less fit for their work. Indeed, Dr. Livingstone remarks on the wisdom of the Jesuits in their missions, in taking pains to ascertain each

brother's particular gift, and to allow him ample opportunity for developing that, whether it were preaching, guiding souls in the confessional, catechising, teaching, botanizing, or collecting butterflies. They justly reasoned that God is wiser than men, and that if God has so disposed the form of a man's faculties as that his religious purpose of promoting the universal good is in him best accomplished through a less immediately religious activity, it redounds *ad majorem Dei gloriam* that he should work as God has bidden him. In this way the mission has the comfort of his presence and sympathy and general helpfulness, the world is advantaged, and the gratification of scientific interests tends to conciliate general good-will to the religious work. This is the truly and not falsely liberal conception of a Christian mission. If the immediate reference to the conversion of men ever ceases to be central and controlling, the work has degenerated out of the true missionary range, and will soon fall away by reason of interior weakness; but if this evangelizing interest remains its unmistakable signature, it may be all the better for having a considerable fringe of more general forces of culture, giving greater pliability and geniality to it, and giving really more momentum to the radiation of its directly spiritual forces into the surrounding darkness. It was in this way, we know, that the Benedictine missions were so effective in Germany and England and Gaul, introducing at once Christianity, letters, music, architecture, greater variety of handicrafts, and greater perfection of agriculture. Adoniram Judson's austere demand, that every missionary family shall abide alone in the waste, needs, doubtless, ever and anon to be suggested as against a self-indulgent aggregation, but it goes beyond apostolic requirements, and is but imperfectly sustained by apostolic example.

Thus we seem to be led, for the ideal of missions among barbarous peoples, to the missionary colony. No one can dispute the eminent and healthy effectiveness, in Central Africa, of Livingstonia, and, above all, of Blantyre. Here we have a great centre of various forces of spiritual, intellectual, and material culture, from which radiates abroad, far and near, the devout yet masculine, strong yet tender gospel of modern Scottish Presbyterianism, cheerily encouraging, among the natives, every tendency to material and social improvement, and making each a channel of religious significance. Here we have an illustrious example of the missionary colony, and of this as defined exactly by the true line, namely, by that which distinguishes an enterprise intended only

for the advantage of the people from one legitimately undertaken, but for the profit of the undertakers. There are, indeed, commercial establishments near Blantyre which are truly, though not formally, an extension of its work, being set on foot, indeed, for profit, but so conducted as to redound unmistakably to the advantage of the natives. With these the Mission maintains close relations of coöperation. There are other commercial adventurers in that region, and some of them, I believe, Her Majesty's representatives, who talk as if it was all very well, indeed, to convert the negroes, but as if the main business of these, once converted, was to show their gratitude by working to the limit of their strength for the race that has evangelized them, especially for those members of it that have had the least to do with the evangelization. In the less aggravated measure of a humaner time, and as dealing with a hardier race, these people would like to renew in Africa the detestable policy of the Spanish Conquistadores in America. Against this iniquitous instinct the missionaries are beginning to raise their voice. One or two copies of the little paper printed at Blantyre have come into my hands, which show that the Conquistadores will not lack their *Las Casas*.

There has been of late in Germany a very lively controversy for precedence between two Latin words, each eminently estimable, *Ora* and *Labora*. This controversy is involved in a wider subject, which I purpose treating in a distinct paper, namely, the relation of Colonial Governments and Missions, but it deserves some attention now, as being even more important than that momentous international question which was agitated for a year or two between the English and the Russian Court, as to whether the Duchess of Edinburgh was to walk before her husband's sisters or come after them. Those German advocates of missions who have suddenly been converted from a former habit of disparagement of them by a consideration of their possible usefulness in colonial policy, are, like Major Wissmann, for instance, greatly given to extolling the Catholic, and disparaging the Protestant missions. It has been remarked by Dr. Warneck that a general afflatus seems to be passing over the world, leading it to laudation of Rome. This is not altogether undeserved, for the sanity and moderation of Leo contrast so brilliantly with the heady and despotic narrowness of Pius, that they ought to have all acknowledgment. But this Rome-praising temper is by no means confined within these reasonable limits of equity and kindness, and is apt to be most flagrant among those who care least for essential

Christianity under any form. In Germany, especially, the eulogies lavished by nominal Protestants on Catholic missions are largely owing to the fact that these are much more easily induced — for a consideration — to subserve purposes of national aggrandizement. Of course, it comes easier for French Catholic missionaries to work for the glory of France (which is Catholic even when atheist) than for Germans of the same church to work for the glory of Germany. The Evangelical House of Hohenzollern, at the head of the Empire, is a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. Still, it has been seen in Uganda that not only German but even French Catholics would rather endure the domination of Germany than of Great Britain. England is the name, of all names, which they detest. Her Protestantism is too vital, too irresistibly expanding; her national policy towards themselves is too large, too kindly, too entirely raised above intolerant jealousy, to be agreeable to them. Among her people there is only enough of the old fierceness left to emphasize the hopelessness of ever bringing her public policy into line with it again. They would rather win their way by inches of grudging acknowledgment from a hostile government than find their haughty assumptions melted down in an equal honor rendered to them among their brethren, and surviving only in the harmless form of abstract theology, like our High Churchmen's claim to have the exclusively apostolic succession, or our Baptist brethren's claim to be the only authentically baptized Christians. It would hardly be extravagant to say, that the only Roman Catholics as yet capable of accepting our English and American policy are the adherents of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and one eminent continental prelate whom the latter is said to have won over to his way of thinking, namely, the Pope of Rome. All the rest are still too deep in the complications of ecclesiastical with political interests which were the necessity of earlier, and are the bane of later ages.

The great point of eulogy with the German admirers of the Roman Catholic missions in uncivilized countries, especially in Africa, is that in their instructions to their converts they put the *Labora* before the *Ora*, while the Protestant missionaries, if we are to believe these gentlemen, reverse the order of precedence, and, indeed, according to them, seldom get so far as to inculcate the *Labora* at all. Now this is so curiously at variance with the essential character of Protestantism, and with the relations of the two religions, on the point of ritual observance and festival neglect of work, that to be told that Catholic missionaries post-

pone the *Ora* to the *Labora*, and Protestant the *Labora* to the *Ora*, sounds very much as if we were told that the Chief Pontiff dispatches the high solemnities of St. Peter's in half an hour or so, arrayed in frock-coat and black trousers, and that the Moderator of the Kirk opens the General Assembly with a protracted High Mass, vested in mitre and brocaded cope. The reversal of fact would be more glaring in this last case, but not a whit more whimsically ridiculous. How can such a caricature of reality, preposterous in its literal and etymological sense of wrong-end-foremost, ever have become current? Even utter absurdity must have its explanation, its traceable genetic development. We will try if we can find it here.

The difference is not that Catholics lay themselves out to conduct their missions in such a way as to please men who have no religious sympathy with them. They may lend themselves too much, sometimes, to political aims, but they never cease to have in mind religious aims, and to follow these principally. Some may realize these in a shallow ritualism, and some in a deeper religious ethics, but all have the same general purpose, and this a distinctly missionary one. Catholicism, however, ever since its differentiation out of primitive Christianity in the second century, has been rather a law from without than a principle working from within. It interprets the will of God more spiritually than the old law, but applies it almost as unspiritually. This characteristic has been intensified ever since the more cultivated Latin priesthood took the ruder northern races under its tutelage. There have been innumerable instances of a glorious depth of regenerate life, but even this has mostly groaned under a heavy yoke of legalism or of superfluous asceticism, and the common type of Catholic religion has been legalism incarnate. Down to the Reformation it may be defined as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, but since the Reformation a good deal of it may be defined, without extravagant uncharitableness, as a jailer to keep men away from Christ, that is, from free and immediate converse with Him. Christ has been in reserve in the background, as a doctrinal necessity, but the priest and the ecclesiastical law have been in the foreground, and while there has been a great deal of religious training, there has been less and less of religious development. We, as Dr. Briggs is now demonstrating, with the force of a modern Luther, are sadly given to interposing the Bible, in our petrified interpretations of it, between ourselves and Christ, but our Catholic brethren are shut off from Him by a double veil,

the outer one incomparably heavier than the inner. The stronger souls, which have a spring of development within themselves, are driven off, and the more submissive are trained and broken in very much after the fashion of dogs and horses, instead of being truly *educated* into Christian manhood and womanhood.

Even Rome herself seems to have become alarmed at the ultimate consequences of the exaggerated policy of repression into which she was frightened by the Reformation. Father Curci speaks of a book written and published a few years ago, after previous papal revision, by a Catholic lady of Paris, sister of a Benedictine monk, in which it was seriously proposed that there should be established in the Church, under the one Pontiff, two parallel hierarchies, one, as now, rigorous and imperative, for spiritual children, the other, far freer and more plastic, for spiritual adults. As yet, however, the note of hierarchical command is very slightly remitted, even among the cultivated races, and barbarians seem to be treated, by many missionaries, altogether as pure children, modified from without, with very slight endeavors to secure modification from within. There are Catholic missions, and those in Africa, which are of a much freer and more spontaneous character, but it does not appear that these engage the particular attention and approbation of Major Wissmann and Dr. Peters. The ideal of these explorers is that of such establishments as they also find, in which the natives are trained to work as an immediate part of their religious discipline. This is easiest where, as in various points of Central Africa, the Fathers buy children outright, and are able to command them by civil as well as spiritual authority. Such missions are really great reform schools. They develop striking results industrially, and allow of a sharp supervision of the habits of their young people, but how much are they really worth? There is no germ of development in them, religious, intellectual, or even industrial, and their influence over the surrounding waste of heathenism is of the weakest. Blantyre would be worth twenty of such, for every end. The Protestant missionaries only here and there are led by special circumstances to work in a way somewhat resembling this (though never with the evil element of slaveholding authority), and therefore they seldom make such a show industrially; but so far as they win way among the natives, they implant principles of self-expansion, which ultimately manifest themselves also in the exterior habits of life. They do not aim at securing a perpetual succession of grown-up children, but at results, which, though

brought to pass much more slowly, are of unending value when achieved.

There are some barbarous tribes which seem really to have no capacity of expansion. Some of the Indians on the Amazon have been under Catholic missionary training for a century, with sincere endeavors to bring them forward, but are acknowledged to have made no intellectual progress whatever. Thirty years ago the long course of Danish labor in Greenland had only resulted in the ordination of a single native. The Eskimo converts, of both the Moravians and the Lutherans, seem to remain immediately and helplessly dependent on them, with no prospect of any wider or stronger development. This race will not impossibly pass away before very long, as statistics once given in the "Atlantic Monthly" seem to imply, especially if a new glacial age is really in slow advance, making their dwelling-place still more inhospitable. Other non-developing races may be capable of indefinite continuance. Christian love cannot neglect them, even though their coming generations are likely to be no farther advanced than the present, and Catholic methods may perhaps suit them very well. The "Encyclopædia Britannica" does not blame the Jesuits for the stationary character of their missionary methods in Paraguay. It holds that the Guarani Indians were capable of no other form of guidance than that which reserved the ultimate direction in the hands of a superior race. In other words, it holds that the Guaranis were not capable of ever becoming anything higher than adult children. It extends this judgment, indeed, to the whole aboriginal American race. This, however, may well be disputed, if, as I remember to have seen stated in the "Nation," the pure Indians of Mexico commonly lead their classes in the schools. Juarez, who passed into the Presidency from the chair of Chief Justice, was a pure Aztec Indian. The Indian mission school, once subsisting in Cornwall, Conn., was broken up when several of the leading young ladies of the town took husbands from it, saying that they did so because they could not find white young men to equal them. The stately bearing of Dr. Muhlenberg was very decidedly enhanced by his one sixteenth of Indian blood, and stateliness is not a sign of inferiority of race. There are very possibly strains of the pure British blood — say in secluded mountain valleys of the South — which have so interbred under unhappy conditions as to have lost the power of intellectual development. But whatever race, or fragment of a race, may have thus lost this power, doubtless needs a peculiarly careful and

continuous tutelage. Roman Catholic guidance may do well for it, although assuredly Moravian guidance would do much better. The Brethren have a singular, divinely given skill of conciliating, a persuasive vigor of pastoral discipline, among cultivated and uncultivated races alike, with the most attentive reverence to personal initiative, individual rights, and parental authority, and of uniting, in their rule of life, decided strictness with an entire freedom from austerity and from anything which induces even a moment's forgetfulness of the absolute fullness of evangelical freedom. They are not so numerous as could be desired, but now, as of old, they seem to be always ready to seek their glory in regions of work in which there seems little glory to be found.

Some are disposed to hold the negroes for one of these races of perpetual childhood. This seems exceedingly improbable. However ancient a race they may be, they are too exuberant in vitality, too full of the *Unverwüstlichkeit*, the inexhaustibleness of life, to have such a monotonous future lying as probable before them. They are not strong in logic, or in mathematics, but they are exceedingly strong in common sense, and essential reasonableness. Their governments have not yet gone much beyond the point of barbarous control for the purpose of forays, but they are plainly capable of development for the maintenance of productivity. Their profound reverence for hereditary authority, though not the ultimate stage of political advancement, seems capable of becoming a long-enduring column of strength to rising civilizations, as it has not quite ceased to be, even in Europe. Now that there is a fair prospect that the Arab demons will be held back, the impression which is gathered in reading accounts from Africa — Central Africa especially — seems to be that of a great future lying before its populations. They deserve to be treated as men and women, with all the large-heartedness of Protestant civilization and religion, under the stimulus of motives that develop the interior character, and the exterior from it. The notion that the manliness of Presbyterianism is not well adapted to the negro is sufficiently refuted for all those who know as well as the present writer knows what sort of negro Christians Presbyterianism breeds in Jamaica, and who has become familiar with the missionary magazines of the three Scottish churches.

How far will the gospel, genuinely received, according to evangelical depth of apprehension and application, advance the civilization of a barbarous race? Just so far as civilization promotes the ends of the gospel. Civilization is for Christ, not Christ for

civilization. Any one that would have it otherwise is not only not a missionary, he is not even a Christian. There are parts of our own country in which the appliances of living are very primitive, and in which the standard of knowledge hardly goes beyond a general intelligence of the course of the world, but in which the Kingdom of God is found in notable purity and strength. The love of God and the love of man prevail, chastity and uprightness are in high esteem, Christ is followed as an example, and the hope of his glory is the anchor of strength. To a Christian, the question how much farther such a community is to advance in the elaborateness of culture is plainly one of very subordinate concern. All that is in humanity must doubtless be developed for the full development of the eternal kingdom of God. There must therefore be points of peculiar specialization, complications of inter-relation, intensities of spiritual, intellectual, æsthetic, commercial, political, inventive action, compared with which such a community as I have just described would appear rude and little advanced. Which regions, or races, are to belong to the more specialized, and which to the simpler forms of life, is a question in which Christianity, as such, has no very particular concern. There is a rudeness of life to which she is essentially opposed, and also an elaborateness of life which is odious to her, — that which is defined by St. John as “the pride of life.” This is that deeply pagan element in the Renaissance to which Mr. Ruskin is so firmly opposed — which manifests itself in stately halls, splendid gardens, wide-stretching parks, all the apparatus of pride that exalts itself above its fellows, instead of brotherhood that draws them near. I do not believe the Papacy to be Antichrist, in itself, but Antichrist has had a great deal to do with building the palaces and churches of Rome, at least since the days of that man of sin, Alexander VI. What is St. Peter’s itself but an expression of “the pride of life”? How different from the old cathedrals! How different, indeed, from the venerable basilica, crowded with the memories of a thousand years, which that libertine fighter, Julius II., instead of renewing it, broke down, with all its monuments, to set the present St. Peter’s in its place! I have never seen it, but there are those whose judgment is of high worth that doubt whether a holy thought was ever engendered in it yet by any working of its own intrinsic character. And so it is throughout our civilization. Much of the elaborateness that we glory in, from the erections of pride to the over-refinements of etiquette and the oppressiveness of excessive culture, and even to copies of

the Book of books illustrated by the great apostle of darkness, "of the charnel-house and of the infernal pit," may need the terrible beneficence of such forces of destruction as lurk in the bosom of our Christendom — perhaps in the bosom of our planet — before the gospel will be suffered to spread over the now barbarous regions. "Who may abide the day of his coming?"

The difference between Christianity and Islam in respect to civilization is not that the gospel has aught against that ruder form of society out of which it grew and thereby found its way to the universal heart, but that it does not, like Islam, so root itself in this or in any particular stage of culture as to make this a part of itself, and thereby to stay humanity from passing easily and naturally from one degree of real advancement to another. Whatever outward conditions, of rudeness or complicated appliance, of inactivity or of eager activity, depress, or defile, or distort the human personality, or divert it from its essential end, — which is an eternal end, — to these the gospel is inflexibly hostile, whether they are called Refinement or Barbarism. To everything else included in the powers and appetencies of Man it is altogether friendly and favorable, for that which neither depresses, defiles, nor distorts the nature of Man is included in the creation and in the redemption of God, and solicits men into the holy brotherhood of eternal life.

Missionaries among barbarians, therefore, do not go abroad as apostles of Civilization, or of Progress, or of Culture. They go abroad as apostles of Christ. If they extort respect from that large part of nominal Christendom which is not of Christ, they may be thankful for it. If they enjoy casual favor, they do well to use it. But if they permanently content it, they may know that they are out of the way. They belong neither with the enemies of Culture nor with the worshipers of Culture. If they convert men and women to Christ, it is always found that they are moved to suggest, and their converts to desire, such fair appliances of life as shall lift it above degrading coarseness and pitiful imperfection, and of course they will endeavor to go well provided for all such fundamental needs. The strictly uncivilized races of mankind are now mostly gathered in Africa. Whether, under the power of the gospel, great transfigurations of outward circumstance await them, no one knows. Whether the renewal of the spirit will lift and renovate even the exterior type remains to be seen. Humble or lofty, they have no doubt some worthy place appointed them in the great organism of regenerate man-

kind. If Christ gives his messengers to develop them for this, the resistless inrushing of Civilization will be a beneficent tide; were it otherwise, it would be a destroying flood.

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

PHILLIPS BROOKS.¹

NEW ENGLAND is provincial, but it is very quick to reflect, though perhaps in a provincial way, the larger movements of thought, especially of religious thought.

New England Orthodoxy and Unitarianism sound very provincial; and except as they were symptoms or reflections of larger movements in England and Germany, they were provincial.

We are all familiar with New England Orthodoxy, its hard, intellectual, unspiritual, and unethical form of doctrine and official religion, combined with that deep, simple, personal faith, that mystic piety, that unflinching trust in God the Father which does not appear often in historic notes or ecclesiastical leaders, but which was then and always has been the salt of the earth and the salvation of a demoralized church. Against this ecclesiastical and doctrinal system the conscience and the more cultivated religious thought of New England protested. The break came, and the liberal movement crystallized into Unitarianism. The same mystic piety existed in the deepest religious lives, but the ethical and humanitarian elements, together with that subtle power which goes with general culture, came to the front.

During the progress of this movement all the religious thought of New England was turned upon the two great bodies.

There were, to be sure, a few churches of other names. In some of the older towns the Episcopal Church existed and did little more than exist. Theologically, its Calvinism or its Arminianism (for there were both in the church) was too pale to interest the strong colorist of New England's religious thought. Ecclesiastically it may have been esteemed in Virginia, Philadelphia, or New York, but in New England it was stamped as a foreigner. Socially it had some weight. An inherited sensitiveness to culture, together with a distrust of emotional religion, revivals, and sudden conversions, bound it with some sympathy to Unitarians.

¹ This article was written in January, 1891. At the suggestion of the editors it now stands as it was written.

But as it stood, the Episcopal Church, though blessed with some strong men, was a weak thing; it had not begun to realize itself, its historic lineage, its possible and inherited breadth of life and depth of spiritual culture.

Clearly, things were in a condition of suspense. Orthodoxy was hampered by its past and its hard and fast lines of attack, and it had to carry on aggressive work with the constant fear of the harassing corps of Unitarianism. The Unitarians, with the exception of a few of the greater leaders, were busy organizing their forces and throwing out some strong and permanent lines, which in the nature of the case were continually shifting; and all this in the face of the enemy. The reading of those old sermons, both of Orthodox and Unitarian, is very interesting to-day as showing how every word of the preacher, every plea to the lost sinner, and every argument for a rational religion was spoken with the sense of an enemy on the flank who would pour in the fire if any loophole were left open.

The larger religious life of a cultivated community could not be content long with that; and the parents of Phillips Brooks, one of whom inherited Orthodoxy in its strongest form and the other a conservative Unitarianism, turned their steps one Sunday morning in his early childhood, not to their accustomed place of worship, — the church of their relative and pastor, Dr. Frothingham, — but to St. Paul's Episcopal Church, where Dr. John S. Stone then ministered. The step was not taken, I believe, through any positive conviction in favor of the Episcopal Church. But, dissatisfied with the pale teachings of Unitarianism, they had to go somewhere; and in the Creed and worship of the Episcopal Church interpreted by the evangelical spirit of Dr. Stone they entered a congenial atmosphere.

In fact, however, they found in that church the rich elements which come with an ancient heritage. Little as they or the members of the church then realized, there was the possibility of a combination of a freedom of opinion with depth of faith and strength of doctrine which, with the historic background, filled more satisfactorily than either of the other bodies their spiritual habits and hopes.

Neither they nor their contemporaries who moved with them appreciated the significance of the change; their modes of religious thought were still in the old lines. With the rising generation came the possibility of a wider horizon and a larger interpretation. The movement was in the air, coming from Ger-

many and presented to New England people through the filtration of English thought and character. Then came a change of emphasis in the terms of the Faith, a readjustment of many of the old statements, a larger spirit and a more spiritual theology. Many lines of thought, skeptical and faithful, centred on the historic Christ; and the Incarnation was lifted from the subordinate position in which Calvinism had placed it.

New England was sensitive to the movement. The old lines of Orthodoxy and of Unitarianism were in the way of becoming confused; some by obliteration, others by a stronger emphasis. What was needed was some personality from outside either of these bodies who could give expression in popular form to this new phase of religious thought and life, and gather the people not necessarily into one religious body, but into a more common understanding, and a closer sympathy on the new lines. I do not think that it is beyond the truth to say, that that personality has been found in Phillips Brooks, and that while many strong men in various religious bodies have done their part in the work, he stands in New England, if not in the land, as the strongest and noblest popular expression of that spirit of reconciliation. For in his character and his sermons are found in fresh and spiritual forms the elements for which the different forces had been struggling.

To my mind one of the strongest though unobtrusive features of his preaching is due to the fact that he has in the depth of his nature a deep conviction of what are in the true sense the evangelical truths. He does not express them often in the old terms of Orthodoxy; he would be misunderstood and would fail of his purpose if he did. But centring his faith in the truth of the Triune God, founding his theology in the Divine Fatherhood, in the truth of the Incarnation and the very present Holy Spirit, he appeals with all the strength of a living faith to the children of the Orthodox whose creeds have to them become dry bones; and at the same time he meets the spiritual yearnings of those whose religious life has been starved by intellectual forms of faith or hazy sentiments of humanitarianism. How he reiterates the appeal to men to believe not as little but as much as they can! The impression which the hearing or reading of one or two sermons may possibly give is that he is misty in his faith, sentimental, liberal, charitable, and without a clear, strong, and firm dogmatic holding-ground. Under this impression he is claimed by men of all faiths and no faiths as belonging to them. He never would have had his

lasting power as a preacher to intelligent and earnest people if such had been the case. I know of no one in whose character and life, as you approach him nearer and study his words more closely, is revealed with such distinctness and strength a clear and in its best sense dogmatic faith in the deeper truths of historic Christianity. It is this element that gives the assurance, the positiveness, and the motive power of much of his preaching.

And, on the other hand, so far as Unitarianism was the expression of the humanitarian and the ethical elements of religion, he has grasped them, and instead of falling into vague generalities about humanity and petty moralities, he emphasizes with all the power at his command the personal relation between God and the individual man, he expressly affirms that the "power which lies at the centre of all success in preaching and whose influence reaches out to the circumference and is essential everywhere" is "the value of the human soul" ("Yale Lect.," p. 255). And he never touches any ethical principle, nor any point of morals, even of the most practical and trivial sort, without connecting them by a living bond to the deepest and most essential doctrines. Life and religion, even to the outermost circumference of practical activities, have a vital relation to the centre. He is thus most practical but never petty; he comes close to the drudgery and trivial duties of life, only, however, to glorify them by uplifting them into the light of heavenly truths.

As I have already hinted, behind the expression of these two phases of religious thought and life, and enfolding them, is an atmosphere of conservatism, dignity, and breadth which, I think (though others may disagree), comes from an education in and appreciation of an historic church with its inheritance of liturgy, creed, institutions, and life, in which during the centuries of its existence wide differences of opinion, temperament, and emphases of faith have been comprehended. While the strong personality glorifies the historic institution, the institution gives larger scope and emphasis to the man.

Instead, therefore, of Dr. Brooks being an anomaly in the Episcopal Church, as many persons seem to think, he is one of the rich and legitimate fruits of a church which has always rejoiced in men and schools of like thought and temper, of the church of Tillotson, Whateley, Arnold, Robertson, Maurice, Kingsley, Stanley, and the late Archbishop of Canterbury. I cannot think of him as a possibility in any other body of Christians.

If I have not formalized too strongly his religious inheritance,

I should now like to move on to suggest three or four features of his thought which his sermons make emphatic.

Our Orthodox ancestors were realists in their study of sin and the evil side of men's characters: they went further and gave their imagination free play, and dwelt upon all the possible depths and horrors of sin. Whether by a reaction from that or by the natural movement which has come in the development of a truer study of life, or both, Dr. Brooks insists on looking at man in the ideal; "the divine in humanity," "the divine Sonship," crop up on almost every page. This makes the poet in the preacher. It lifts men out of themselves into their higher possible life, rouses their spiritual ambitions, exalts their hope, and gives that buoyancy and thrill of expectancy which runs through all his sermons. This determination to think the best of men and refusal to see their worst makes him the optimist that he is, and gains for him the confidence of those who wish better things of themselves. It is this that gives him peculiar power and satisfaction in preaching to congregations of strangers in distant cities, in theatres, and at his own free evening services. Those people and the petty trivialities of their lives are unknown to him; his imagination is therefore freer to kindle and open up high possibilities. This appeal to the ideal gives him his strong hold on young men; it meets their hopes and fills them with a glow of romantic aspirations and practical ambitions. It may, perhaps, be said that Dr. Brooks, who has a deep sense of the dreadfulness of sin in itself, does not quite look the facts of life in the face, and does not, at least in his sermons, paint the life of to-day as dark as in some of its features it really is. When he does turn directly upon sin and the sinner, it is with searching power. But more often (can it be too often?) the congregation are sent forth with the glow of the beauty of the life in God which makes them feel religious, but which may not prompt them to take the first step in the religious life, a renunciation of their besetting meannesses and sins. Even though there be this danger and this result, I believe that Dr. Brooks is consistent in his method; for he believes that, in the long run, men are brought to a sense of sin not so much by the horror of sin as by a realization of the beauty of holiness. To this he tries to lead them. And surely one of the confessed elements of his power is his persistent, buoyant hopefulness and his insistence upon the possible ideal for every man.

There is another method in which he persists which turns some men, especially those of exact and perhaps scientific habits of

thought but with limited horizons, away from him. I have known such men to leave Trinity Church, and go where, as they say, they can get more definite teaching. They are tired of having their emotions aroused and of being urged to seek for the truth themselves; they want clear teaching which will give them the truth in definite form.

This Dr. Brooks will not give them. He has too high a regard for truth, for the right of private judgment, and for the duty of each man to seek the truth, and he is too humble-minded himself to assume to dictate to men that his opinions must be theirs.

He, like a true prophet, preaches what he believes to be the truth, and expects others to act like true men in accepting that truth so far as they see it to be the truth, and no farther.

Of course, this lays him open to misinterpretation, to the report that he is indifferent as to what men believe and what their creeds are, — a false impression gained by some of those who admire as well as those who criticise him, — a misrepresentation, however, to which any true prophet or teacher is subject.

Again, the movement in science and in other phases of thought which is expressed by the word "development" has, as we all know, entered theology, or rather has been hailed and welcomed by theology, as an aid in the interpretation of many problems, and is doing good service in the work of popular interpretation of spiritual life. Dr. Brooks, with his quick sympathy for all fresh methods and modern movements, has caught this and has brought it into effective service. He chafes at the effort of men to make the spiritual the exceptional and unnatural; he rings the note again and again, that "the higher life to which man comes, and especially the highest life in Christ, is in the true line of man's humanity; there is no transportation to a foreign region." "The fullest Christian experience is simply the fullest life. To enter into it is in no wise strange." "The wonder and the unnaturalness is that any child of God should live outside of it, and so in all his life should never be himself." How deftly he reveals, from some text which had always seemed far away, some great spiritual law which has as close relations to nature as to what is called the supernatural. The most real things in life are spiritual, not physical. Nature is but the parable of spiritual realities; the one moves up to the other. And by the use of this comprehensive principle he leads men from earth to heaven as naturally as if they were still moving on the earth; and before the hearer knows it he is wafted on some common law which

he had always accepted as true of nature and the physical world up to spiritual conclusions which he has always denied, and now which he cannot but accept.

It is in the use of this method that Dr. Brooks does some of his happiest, freshest, and most interesting, though not always most effective work. In his last volume of sermons it is used rather to weariness. I cannot but think that under pressure of work and lack of time to read, Dr. Brooks has fallen into the habit of attacking his subject in what to him is the most natural and easy way. This way is to him most natural, hence the danger of monotony of method.

But when one considers the enormous amount of sermon work that Dr. Brooks turns off year after year, one is amazed, not that he should sometimes repeat his thoughts, his illustrations, and his methods, but that, even in the occasional repetition, he should be so uniformly and perpetually fresh. And the same intelligent men and women who were delighted with his first sermon in Trinity Church twenty years ago, and who have heard him Sunday after Sunday since, listened to his sermon last Sunday with the same delight and the same sense of the inexhaustible freshness of the thought and spiritual power of the preacher.

And this now brings us more closely to the man himself.

In his Yale Lectures he defines preaching as the communication of truth by man to men, — the two essential elements being truth and personality. Those persons who have read the lectures (which, by the way, are for their purpose fully as remarkable as his sermons) recollect with what emphasis he dwells upon the necessity of the personal character of the preacher.

It is because he stands the test of his own high demands of the preacher that I feel he is most admirable. Of course, all true preaching must be through the man. And yet when one sees how the strongest preachers sometimes lose their charm when we come into closer contact with them, as we observe some weakness, some sentimentalism or egotism or petty selfishness or sensitiveness, one is bound to confess the legitimate and worthy success of a man who in all success, admiration, and flattery has remained as humble and simple as a child, sincere, unselfish, never weakened in his moral fibre, sensitive to truth, sympathetic, and full of courage. His is one of those rich natures that open up fresh beauties of character as you enter his life more closely.

We have all come under the spell of his eloquence at one time or another.

Standing in the pulpit he states and then repeats his text. The surface meaning of the words is clear to us, but the truths which he is to call forth from them are as yet unsuggested.

Then in a few light, happy strokes the lines of the thought begin to reveal themselves. Men may call his work here ingenious; it is more than that; it is the natural movement of a fresh and unusual mind. In his freshness of attack Dr. Brooks is often unique. Soon the vivid scene, the appeal to Nature and her laws, or to some familiar experience of life, opens up the theme. Then the subject rises into clearer vision: the truth which at the first seemed so strange or paradoxical now takes on familiar shape; but, though familiar, it is larger and stronger than we had ever conceived it. The flood of thought, imagination, figure, argument, and appeal now gains strength and volume; flash after flash is thrown upon the truth; new lights, new forms, fresh revelations break forth.

His illustrations are sometimes over bold; occasionally newly coined words and multiplied adjectives suggest haste; for the preacher is after deeper things than style; he has no time for polish and erasures. Sometimes the preacher is caught and held in the interest of his own thought and imagination; he gives his fancy and sagacity too full play; he talks about the truth too elaborately; he overloads with words and imagery; he does not seem to move as directly as he might; but the work is interesting; the attention is more than held, it is enslaved.

Some shrewd remark, some flash of quiet humor, a delightful or suggestive figure snatched from the hillsides of New England, often betokens his heritage; and then an aphorism, a fresh statement of old truth or a side remark throws a flash of light up some path of thought which we fain would follow. But the preacher's voice and rapid utterance warn us to move on with him. There is no time for wandering and for curious research. He respects his congregation too much for that. They are not on a quest for happy thoughts; this is no summer's holiday; they are all, preacher and people, earnest in their search for truth. Then as the heart of the subject is reached, the conviction comes over one that the truth which the preacher had caught has now caught him and filled him with its glory. The whole personality of the man is brought to bear. Thought chases thought with that marvelous flow of language. Words, figures, and whole sentences spring to fresh life at his bidding. Soon character and spiritual illumination move in and join the reason and imagina-

tion. Then, when he is at his best, he flings imagery, figures, and fancy aside, and throws himself, with all his power and personality, in the strongest, clearest, tersest language, into the congregation, and brings home to the consciences and hearts of men the practical issue. But just as the movement reaches its climax the preacher, with the self-mastery of every true prophet, falls into the background, and only the truth stands forth impersonated in Christ himself. Our duty to that truth, and our glory in it, sends us forth with hope and buoyancy upon our daily work.

We are his contemporaries and under the spell of his great personality; it is not yet time to discuss where he belongs in the line of Christian preachers. So much depends upon the definition of the words that we need not take up the question as to whether he is one of the great preachers of historic Christendom.

But if a great preacher is one who stands head and shoulders above his brethren in his power of prophecy, who interprets to men through the freshest methods of thought the old truths of the gospel, who gives comfort to the heavy laden, hope to the repentant, and strength to the weak, who, without degrading the pulpit by extravagance or artificial methods, holds thousands of men and women and uplifts them, who in his day and generation moves, and even stirs to its depths, the deeper convictions of a great community, who never flinches to speak for liberty, for truth, and for Christ, who in opposing men's prejudices, and by rebuke, appeal, and example in changing their lives, has always won their affection, who in throwing the whole force of his great personality has never been suspected of preaching himself, but Christ, — then Phillips Brooks is a great preacher.

Since this article was written, nearly two years ago, Phillips Brooks has been elected and consecrated Bishop of Massachusetts, and after fifteen months of devoted and supreme labor has fallen asleep.

His election to the episcopate and confirmation by the representatives and bishops of the whole church, in spite of the bitter protests of a small minority, emphasize the statement that "instead of being an anomaly in the Episcopal Church, Dr. Brooks is one of the rich and legitimate fruits of a church which has always rejoiced in men and schools of like temper and thought."

His dignified silence in the face of the protests and misrepresentations of a fraction of the minority revealed the saintly spirit of the man.

His new work brought to notice a talent which those near him had always recognized, but which had been overshadowed by his other powers. In administrative ability Bishop Brooks was exceptional. The ease, speed, and effectiveness with which he transacted business were enough to have made him a wide reputation in any great executive position.

But to him the great work of the Bishop, as of the presbyter, was to preach the gospel. From his college days he had been an easy, graceful, and strong writer. But through all his ministry he never trusted to genius. He thought out, constructed, and wrote his sermons as conscientiously as the most commonplace parson. After years of such training, he gradually moved into the habit of preaching without notes. He then revealed more than ever before that marvelous flow and use of language. The torrent of thought and words heaped upon each other swept the congregation along with him. While his written sermons were usually more thoughtful and gave more food for after reflection, his most effective and greatest work was done in some of his extemporaneous sermons, especially those preached under the high pressure of great congregations made up only of men.

During his episcopate he had no time to undertake much new sermon work. And yet he rarely preached a sermon or made an address or speech that was not new in the freshness of statement, in the stronger and larger emphasis of the truth, and in the outflow of his ever-growing personality. For great as he was in his early years, he was to the day of his death developing rapidly in intellectual power and sweep of spiritual vision. The amount of speaking that he did was appalling; four to seven sermons and addresses on a Sunday, with sermons, addresses, and speeches in quick succession through the week. The break came as he would have had it. Old age had few charms for him. "I don't want to be old, but I should like to live on this earth five hundred years," was a characteristic remark.

When all has been said about his eloquence, his mastery of language and his tumult of thought, we are turned back to the fact that the sermons were great because the man was great. His was a great soul. He stood above us, he moved in higher realms of thought and life, he had a wider sweep of spiritual vision, he was gigantic. And yet he was so completely one of us, so sympathetic, childlike, and naturally simple that it was often only by an effort of thought that we could realize that he was great. Kingly in character, we buried him like a king.

William Lawrence.

A CALL TO PRESBYTERIAN LAYMEN.

It would not be true to say that the recent heresy trials in the Presbyterian Church had excited attention only in religious circles. The secular papers have given much space to reports of them, and of what is said about them. They involve a question that arouses interest in men who do not themselves belong to any church. In fact, it would not be possible for such a struggle to take place without the notice of the world. It cannot be, however, that the true importance and full gravity of the present crisis are realized, even in the Presbyterian Church itself. Nothing but the failure to see and appreciate this will account for the apathy which on the whole prevails. To all appearances the rank and file in this branch, as in all branches of the Christian Church of this age, and indeed many of its office bearers, take so little active interest in heresy trials that they remain substantially mere spectators. To them, it may be, such trials are only a form of theological dissension from which they instinctively wish to stand aloof. Considered abstractly, they are perhaps no more, but practically they are vastly more. It all depends upon whether one looks at the particular matter in dispute, or first upon the fact that there can be such a dispute over such a matter, and then upon its natural and hence probable consequences. Viewed in the latter way the spectacle becomes appalling.

Here is a conflict within the Church of Christ. It is not merely a difference and an argument. It takes the form of a trial. There are prosecutors, a defendant, a court, a possible acquittal or conviction, and if the latter a sentence. That sentence may be an expulsion from the ministry, — in one case has been a suspension from it, which is *pro tanto* an expulsion. The sentence is surely grave. Who are the offenders, and what is the offense? The offenders are Christian ministers and professors in Christian seminaries, whose work it is to fit others for the Christian ministry. Of what are they accused? They hold views, it is answered, in conflict with the standards of the church. This they themselves deny. Before the original tribunals, the entire contest has been over this dispute. That statement of the question, however, will not suffice for the purpose now in hand. What is the real "heresy" which underlies the technical controversy? What actual doctrines have been assailed or abandoned? The peril impending over the church will be more clearly understood by a statement of some doctrines to which no one accuses them of being disloyal.

The Christian Church believes in the sovereignty of a triune God; the divinity of Christ; his incarnation, sacrificial death, and resurrection; the all-sufficiency of his atonement; the sinfulness of all men; their absolute need of salvation by grace; God's readiness to save them in and for Christ; and the duty of those who have themselves come to Christ to be thenceforth co-workers with Him for the salvation of their fellow-men. All these doctrines and many more are firmly held by men who have lately been brought to the bar of a Christian tribunal for trial, and one of them for sentence. That being so, it is not worth while to ask what it is that they do not believe. It is enough to know that a man who believes all this can be and has been, not by a secular but by a Christian tribunal, declared unfit to be a Christian minister and forbidden, so far as this tribunal could forbid him, to preach the gospel of Christ. It is this which constitutes the real gravity of the present crisis, and should wake the Presbyterian Church at large from its present apathy. Shall this spectacle be longer exhibited to the world with the silent acquiescence of this church? This is no mere theological dissension. It is a living question of religion.

To those actually engaged in the formal contest it apparently possesses an importance that cannot be conceded to it. Whether there be anything in the study of scientific theology that tends to confuse the relative importance of its various doctrines, or whether it be merely the heat of controversy, by which it is to be explained, the fact remains that in one tribunal a majority and in another a large and earnest minority, upon charges involving none of the great doctrines already enumerated, voted for conviction, and either approved or stood ready to approve a sentence closing the lips of a Christian minister. Before them lay fields white for the harvest; but they deliberately declared that no one, if they could prevent, should enter in to reap unless he believed something more than all these.

Unless the popular sentiment of Presbyterians be opposed to this, and make itself known and respected, it is not impossible that in their highest church tribunal the same spirit may prevail and the same sentence be pronounced. If that be right and for the best, let it come. But before it comes, let every member of this church realize that he has responsibility and duty in the matter. Let him reflect upon the situation and its possibilities, and having reached a deliberate decision let him make his influence felt. It is a question that concerns him as well as the prosecutors,

the judges, and the accused. Its outcome can but have momentous effects upon the interests of religion, advancing or retarding the cause of Christ. Which will it be? That is the real question. For when any subject of his kingdom has determined this, he knows on which side he should be found.

Have these heresy trials, then, already helped or hindered the cause of Christ? Will a continuance of the struggle help or hinder it? Does the church honor its King and edify itself in this way? The mission of Christ's church is not to settle points of doctrine, but to help save the world. Doctrines there are and must be, but they are means to an end and no more. They must not be allowed in any way to prevent or hinder that end, either in themselves or by what is done to inculcate or defend them. The moment that is the case, either they or their champions, perhaps both, are to be condemned. This is a simple test, but faithfully applied it will solve all doubt as to many a "heresy" crusade. Let us apply it now.

Dissatisfaction on the part of some with certain views publicly expressed has resulted in two ecclesiastical trials. No one can have read the papers, religious and secular, without seeing that these trials developed much that was far from an exhibition of Christian virtues and graces, if indeed it fell short of being a scandal before the world. Hot words have been exchanged, angry feeling has been manifested, and bitterness of judgment and of speech. Unfair conduct and violation of orderly and constitutional procedure have been charged. All this, to some extent, in the very tribunals before which the trials were had, and how much more outside. There is no need to reject or ignore the common excuse for this, — that theologians are but men, with the frailties of men, and that the more deeply a controversy takes hold of men and stirs their souls with a sense of its importance, the more apt they are to be carried, in the ardor of strife, further than they mean or know. This may excuse the man, but it condemns the controversy, unless it can be declared in the sight of God and in the light of Christ's teachings to have been unavoidable. For if a controversy must produce these results, that may be the very reason for not having it.

If these be the consequences in the church, what is their natural effect upon the world, — that world, which in God's providence is to be saved in and through this church, if saved at all? What can the effect be to see followers of Christ, brothers in Christ, engaged in such dissensions, indulging in such conduct,

and while expressly conceding that accusers and accused are sincere Christians, fellow-members of the mystical body of Christ, still insisting that the latter are unfit to be his heralds, and must be debarred from proclaiming his sovereign rights, and extending his royal offers of pardon? The world can come to but one conclusion from all this: that in the opinion of the church on earth, — the only mirror in which it can ever see the church universal, — it is of more importance to be what is called “sound” on doctrines, confessedly non-essential to salvation, than to work for the conversion of sinners. That to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, his divinity, his atonement, is not enough to entitle a man to obey his express command to preach the gospel. Whatever else may be said about that, it is safe to say that it is not the way to draw the world to the cross of Christ.

Where is the warrant for all this? It is time to draw the line plainly between theology and religion; to proclaim in a way to command respect and submission, that religion is the higher, and that when they come into collision theology must promptly go to the wall. The immediate application of this great principle should be that when theologians undertake to decide whether they will permit a preacher of Christ’s message to go on with this work their inquiry must be, — not what doctrines does this man reject or question, but what does he accept and believe. And this application must be made, if not by Presbyterian ministers, then by Presbyterian laymen. The hour has come, and the need is great for a popular uprising in the church. Once more the cry is heard: “Who is on the Lord’s side?” Who will be content to stand by the great fundamental truths — and by them alone — on which the church visible was founded, and by which it has achieved all its conquests; that God is ready to receive all who truly come to Him through Christ, as their divine and atoning Saviour; that *He* commands all who have thus come to Him to bear witness for Him by preaching his gospel; that *He* accredits them as his ambassadors; and that those whom *He* has received and sent forth, and accredited, cannot by any human power, secular or ecclesiastical, be told to hold their peace, and refrain from speaking his message? Who will declare that there may be truths, non-essential to salvation, which *He* has revealed, but which these servants of his do not clearly see, and hence do not and cannot accept; yet that this has never by Him been made the test of their fitness, or right, to be his ambassadors, and that their commissions come from Him alone?

If these be really the views of the great body of Presbyterians, then in the councils of the church those theologians misrepresent their constituents, who are willing to imperil the advance of Christ's kingdom on earth, by this spectacle of Christians fighting with one another, instead of with the common foes of themselves and of their King. If not their views, ought they not to be? Are they, or are they not, the views most pleasing to the great Head of the church? Can there be any doubt about this? It is a question of right and wrong, — in the sight of God. Can any one seriously maintain that He approves of the present strife; that He ratifies and sanctions a sentence that forbids one of his servants to proclaim the glad tidings of salvation to a world, dying for lack of this salvation, until he will say that he has changed his belief in regard to the particular doctrine, for questioning which he has been condemned? How many will stand up, in the sight of God, and vouch to the church for his approval of what is now going on in his name? Yet that is the only thing that can justify or excuse it. The church assumes to exercise authority in matters of religion, but it should beware never to exercise it, unless absolutely certain that God himself bestows the authority, and indorses its exercise. Better far to err upon the safe side. It is persuasion, and not authority, that will do most to bring sinners to Christ. How many in the Presbyterian Church feel this absolute certainty to-day? How many, even while they permit themselves to participate, or at least to acquiesce, nevertheless hesitate and are conscious at times of painful doubts, whether there be not an awful mistake in this method of doing God service? Would they not welcome some divine revelation of the right spirit for them to cherish, and the proper course for them to pursue, in this crisis? They will have no new revelation. To them apply the old words: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." The necessary revelation has already been made, and it will not be repeated, because they choose to shut their ears to it. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace." Is there any uncertainty in that? Is that not enough? There is something, then, even more specific. There was a heresy trial, while Christ, in human form, was here on earth. Over it He himself presided; from his own lips came the decision. We read that his disciples came to Him one day, and told Him that they had seen some one, who followed not with them, casting out devils in his name, and they had forbidden him to do this, because he followed not with them. "But Jesus said: Forbid him not."

Were our ears not so dulled by listening to the voices of earth, and were our hearts more open to the lessons of heaven, might we not now hear that divine command, through all the intervening centuries, — "Forbid him not"?

George A. Strong.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

THE ANDOVER BAND IN MAINE.

THERE have been several Andover bands. Very early in the history of the seminary, groups of men, animated by a common impulse, banded together, and selected particular fields of labor to which Providence seemed especially to call them. A memorable band went to India, and founded the stations of the American Board in the pagan world. Another went to the Levant, to enlighten the Moslem, the Jew, the Greek, and the Armenian. Another well-known group heard the call from beyond the Mississippi, and helped conspicuously to mould the institutions of the great State of Iowa.

The same missionary spirit is actively at work in the seminary to-day. Many of the ablest and truest men are asking only where in the wide world they are most needed, and thither they are ready to go. No better illustration of this could be desired than the attitude of five members of the last class, who held themselves in readiness to accept the most difficult and unattractive localities that could be found, asking only that they might go together. The foreign field and the work in our great cities were duly considered, but finding that candidates were not wanting for such positions, they were drawn to another sphere of ministerial labor, which seemed to present a peculiar claim in the fact that it was uninviting to most men, and unremunerative in the ordinary sense of the term.

The more they reflected upon the condition of the average country church in out-of-the-way places, the more their hearts turned in sympathy to that large and neglected portion of the Lord's heritage, which has done and is doing so much for the country and for the church, supplying often our Davids and Elijahs, — our kings and our prophets, — and yet is practically overlooked by those who are seeking "desirable pastorates."

Pursuing their inquiries, they corresponded with some of our

state missionary societies and gathered important information concerning various sections of New England. Through the activity of Secretary Adams of the Maine society, the way soon opened for the five men to take parishes in Franklin and Somerset counties in the Pine-Tree State. Here, in a well-settled agricultural and lumbering district, were numerous feeble churches without pastors. An arrangement was made by which a very moderate salary was guaranteed, two fifths of the amount coming from the Missionary Society.

Through the kind offices of the church in Farmington, whose pastor, the Rev. Hugh Elder, had done much to promote the enterprise, these Andover men were ordained together by an ecclesiastical council, September 27, 1892, in the spacious and beautiful sanctuary of that well-known county seat. It was a unique and solemn occasion, full of tender sympathy, wise counsel, and prayerful consecration. All who were present speak in the warmest terms of the spirit and purpose of the candidates, who were welcomed to the fellowship of the churches and assigned to their several parishes as follows: E. R. Smith, to Temple; O. D. Sewall, to Strong; W. W. Ranney, to Phillips; E. R. Stearns, to New Vineyard; and J. C. Gregory, to Bingham. As these towns are not very far apart, the cherished plan of the band to work side by side can be carried out under very favorable conditions.

It is, of course, too early to ask for the results of such an undertaking, but having just spent a week among these brethren, in response to their request for a course of lectures in their several towns, the writer can give some impressions of the work in its preliminary stages, as it appears to an outsider. And these impressions relate both to the difficulties of the field and the encouragements which already appear.

I. As to the difficulties. It was expected that they would be numerous and grave. The young men came here with that understanding. They wanted to grapple with the problem at close quarters; to ascertain what the real difficulties were, in order that, by their united endeavor, they might in some way, or in various ways, help those churches, and so perhaps contribute their experience to aid others in a similar position.

The prominent difficulties in the country-church problem of our time may be classified under three heads, namely, isolation, individualism, and denominationalism.

1. Isolation. By this I mean the lonely way in which so many

of our farmers live, on their own outlying lands at a considerable distance from one another, and quite remote from any village. This, I know, has always been the case since the early settlement of the colonies. And while it has done much to strengthen some of the best qualities of New England character which we could ill afford to lose, it has gradually become the occasion of serious deficiencies in our country life. The rest of the world has grown visibly and helpfully social in a thousand ways; but the rural population, living apart from the stream of modern life, is left behind and placed at a great disadvantage. Most people in such a situation would in the course of time lose heart, and, under the pressure of apparent duty or economy, feel obliged to withdraw from active participation in the affairs of the village or town to which they naturally belong.

The severity of our winter climate, and the condition of the roads during a large part of the year, often seem to imprison families in their own houses even against their will. Of course there are always some exceptions. Every town has its public-spirited men, who, though living in the outskirts, are willing to overcome the difficulty, and serve as selectmen, school committee, or church officers. Such men deserve great credit for the pains they take to bear their share, and more than their share, of the public burdens. They often guide the municipal and religious and social affairs of the community. They read and think, and help their neighbors, and plan for the general good. From this class come many of our legislators and magistrates; and their children get the benefits of our higher schools of learning, and often take their place among our most influential citizens all over the land.

If our farming population were of this character generally, the question we are discussing could be easily answered. But the fact is, that very many families, under the adverse conditions of such isolation, grow out of sympathy with social and religious life altogether, influenced by the mistaken idea that it costs time and money which they cannot afford, when really by trying to get on without the advantages of such a life, they are paying a price which they certainly cannot afford, even the surrender of their best impulses. And the alternative thus forced upon themselves is a habit which is almost sure to lead, sooner or later, to indifference, prejudice, ignorance, and ultimate degradation. This sad tendency has been observed and lamented by many a pastor in a country parish, and it is one of the obstacles which our friends of the Andover band are obliged to consider in their plans for thorough and comprehensive work.

2. Another serious difficulty lying in the way of a reform in such sparsely settled communities is individualism. This is in part an outgrowth of our isolated farm life. It is a well-known characteristic of the American people, and it has contributed no small share to the development of some of our typical institutions. No one would have it eliminated; but when found in excess it must be curbed, or it will defeat the very purpose it was designed to subserve. The republic rests upon the right of private judgment and personal responsibility, but when that private and personal idea is exaggerated, and claims for itself an exclusive prerogative, it becomes self-sufficient, uncanny, disagreeable, and a great hindrance to any united effort. It is a hard enemy to reach, for it will not listen to argument; it is indifferent to persuasion; and it does not altogether succumb to kindness, though the latter is by far the most hopeful weapon to be used against it.

The great trouble with this Yankee trait is that it tends to disintegration in the church, in society, in politics. You cannot organize anything with it. It is always kicking in the traces. When a man insists not only upon judging for himself, but also upon acting wholly by himself, what are you going to do? You and your neighbors cannot well get on without him, for his lot is cast among you. You want his influence on the right side. You need his help in important enterprises, for he is an industrious, thrifty, sober citizen. But he has no personal interest in the church, none in the social or intellectual movements of the town. He never thinks of extending or accepting such a thing as hospitality; that would be a waste of time. He voluntarily and persistently segregates himself as far as he can. He looks after his cattle, but not much after his children. He pays his taxes, and probably votes. He goes to the post office, and talks with the men in the store. He discusses a good deal, and criticises freely. He may have a soft side to his heart somewhere, but no one, except his wife, would ever believe it.

Such men are too common everywhere. They are especially conspicuous in the country town, where habitual seclusion tends to make one self-centred. Sometimes they yield their independence a little and become members of churches and other organizations, and then they are known as dogmatic, opinionated, unsympathetic. They may be stout defenders of their own creed, but intolerant toward any other. So far from encouraging a pastor in his work, they often seem to be braced against him, unless he yields to their influence, and is willing to see the church

suffer and stagnate. It may be said that this is an extreme type of individualism. Perhaps it is, but it represents a trait which is widely felt and seriously deplored by those who are working for the evangelization and improvement of society.

3. A still greater difficulty in the way of progress in a country town lies in denominationalism. This is the *bête noire* that vexes the soul of the true philanthropist. It has grown to be such an appalling evil as to render life in a small village uncomfortable, and some would say intolerable, to people of any breadth. And this, not because the village is small or remote, but because the few people living there — excellent people, all of them — are divided into distinct, if not hostile camps, and maintain a perpetual armed truce on denominational lines. To receive the favor of one camp is equivalent to ostracism from the others. No one at heart likes the system, but every one seems to be entangled in its meshes.

Historically, we all know how this has come about. Philosophically, it is the outgrowth of that intense individualism which has already been considered. Theoretically, there would be no serious objection to having as many churches as the community could properly support. But practically, it might as well be acknowledged that a small town can support only one decently; and to attempt more than this is only a struggle against nature and reason and common sense. Sectarian zeal often springs from pride, and is so misdirected that loyalty to one's particular church frequently takes the place of loyalty to Christ and to his greater church, — a fatal blunder, resulting in narrowness and rivalry, in mutual suspicion and jealousy.

The average country town has burdened itself with a multiplicity of churches which it cannot support; and so it has to content itself with irregular or inferior ministries, neglected and sometimes dilapidated houses of worship, a vanishing membership, — an expensive and useless luxury. And all for what? Not to advance the kingdom of Christ, for it is painfully evident that his kingdom is being retarded by such ill-judged agencies; not to offer the gospel to hungry men, but rather to lock it up in ecclesiastical storehouses where the hungry cannot, or do not, find it; not to illustrate the Christian doctrines and graces, but rather to caricature them.

This is a criticism of the system as it appears to observing thousands all over the land. It applies no more to Maine than to Minnesota, but it indicates a serious difficulty in the way of pastoral and sociological work in almost all rural sections. Our

Andover band has to encounter it. Time and tact will be required to deal wisely with such a complicated problem. Long-standing and deeply-rooted prejudices exist in most of the towns, and sadly interfere with any sincere attempt to unite the Christian forces, as such, in any effort for the common good. Sectarian feeling has to be considered at every turn. Some of the congregations are variously composed, and the different elements have to be balanced in choosing committees or Sunday-school teachers, in arranging for concerts or lectures, or even in appointing an usher or a janitor. In some places it is found impossible as yet to organize the Y. P. S. C. E. for the same reason.

The struggle to maintain separate services has sometimes proved too great for the perseverance even of the saints; and there has followed a period of closed doors and exemption from pastoral care. Then some other denomination would bestir itself with unwonted activity, and draw in the public. Whereupon its rivals, recovering from slumber, and quickened into new life by what they saw, would resume operations at the old stand, "hire" another minister, and make desperate efforts to recover their lost ground.

Sometimes the weakness of a church comes from a decrease of the population. Once three churches were well supported in the town, but now there is need of only one. Yet all the three hold on tenaciously. Not one of them is willing to yield to the others; and in this they are too often sustained by the denominational missionary societies, each of which thinks its own church fittest to survive.

The union arrangement, by which each church furnishes a minister for the combined congregation for a certain time, has been only partially successful. In such cases the trouble has been that denominational differences were kept constantly in sight, and the evils of partisanship would be developed even more than in the case of separate congregations. The Maine Interdenominational Commission, which met at Lewiston last December, has the confidence of the various bodies, and is a step in the right direction. As yet, however, it concerns itself only with the occupation of new fields. It would do well to magnify its office, and arouse public sentiment still more upon the subject, and perhaps reach a position in which it could be authorized to handle the *quæstio vexata* which is before us all.

II. Having faced the difficulties of the field before us, we may

now look for the encouragements. And happily these are enough to cheer our volunteer band, and the people to whom they are sent, and the large number of friends who are looking on at a distance, and praying for a rich blessing upon all their efforts.

1. There is much to be expected from the character of the inhabitants in that part of Maine.

(1.) They are homogeneous, of the good old New England stock. Most of the names one hears among them are either English or Scotch. Manufacturing industries have not invaded their fair domain and brought in a large admixture of alien blood. There are many advantages in working among a primitive and uncorrupted people. They usually know and respect each other. There are no sharp lines of social distinction. They are all more or less susceptible to the same influences.

(2.) They are also an intelligent people. They have always enjoyed the benefit of our school system, which they maintain with creditable pride. They take various newspapers and magazines; and in most of their houses you will find a fair collection of standard books.

(3.) They have generally moral and religious instincts. These are a part of their inheritance from the sturdy settlers who, in clearing the forest, always planted the church. This traditional respect for religion is a great support to any pastor who labors among them. It encourages order and virtue and charity, and stimulates ambition in various directions.

(4.) Such a people become firm friends of a good cause when once enlisted in its favor. They are worth seeking and saving, for their natural conservatism will furnish a much-needed safeguard for the important interests vested in the church.

2. It is no slight advantage that the field chosen for these labors is a fine, healthy, picturesque region. It has all the essential elements of an ideal landscape. An artist would revel in the hills and valleys, in the rocks and lakes and gushing streams, in the farmhouse and sawmill, with the men at work, and the children coming home from the district school, and the cows going to the spring. These all give life to the picture, and ought to make this part of Maine a resort for the lovers of nature when weary of the care and noise of city life.

3. Such a community is comparatively free from the ravages of intemperance and other vices that abound in all populous centres. It must be a great relief to the friends of reform to be able to expend their strength on other and less obstinate evils. In the

absence of the saloon element, all ordinary difficulties seem to be manageable, when properly treated.

4. Chief among the encouragements of the enterprise must be mentioned the character of the band who have undertaken it. Though differing in many respects from each other, they have certain traits in common, and are all animated by the same high purpose. Coming, as they do, from four of the New England States, they have been firmly knit together in the seminary, and led by the spirit of consecration to offer their joint service to these missionary churches in Maine.

(1.) Any one who meets them sees that they are in earnest. They have taken up the work with enthusiasm, and find it absorbingly interesting. They want no chapel-of-ease, no cloister life. While pursuing their studies, their minds were largely occupied with theological problems, but now they have another problem on their hands, no less attractive, and perhaps more easily solved, namely, how to help the people whom they have come to serve. To this they are bending all their energies.

(2.) They seem to be also judicious in their plan of operations. Knowing the sensitiveness of human nature, they avoid giving offense as far as possible. An older clergyman in the neighborhood says they show remarkable wisdom in adapting themselves to the peculiar condition in which they are placed as to the habits and prejudices of the people whom they meet on various occasions. They do not assume to criticise or oppose, but to find out what by general consent is needed, and then to offer such assistance as they can to remedy existing defects, to share the burdens of others, and to provide facilities for building up the best possible character.

(3.) In doing this our friends have acted in a very frank and genial manner. This has gained for them wide sympathy and support, especially among the young. No one could accuse them of being stilted or artificial in manner or in speech. They have simply followed their generous impulses, in natural, buoyant ways, without suppressing their underlying desire to win men to Christ.

(4.) The band seems to have been very fertile in resources. They not only adopt the ordinary approved methods of work, but they are inventing new ones that are especially adapted to their locality. In their plan they include everything that affects the people; and so they are studying educational, social, economic, and industrial questions, as well as those that are technically religious. And they are able to show how some things can be done. Not

content with preaching merely, they spend much of their time among the people with encouraging words and suggestive plans. Prayer-meetings are strengthened, singing-schools established, private classes formed for special study, literary and musical entertainments given, neighborhood gatherings encouraged, and useful societies organized, with the church as the central feature and inspiration of it all. If occasion requires, they are not ashamed to serve as sexton, make the fire, light the lamps, and shovel the paths. But generally they have shown a superior wisdom by getting other people to do all sorts of things for the common good.

(5.) These young men are contented and happy in their chosen field of labor. Being unmarried, they give their time ungrudgingly to their parishes, and accept without complaining whatever hardships are involved. They get plain country fare at their boarding-places. They have little surplus salary to spend in books and luxuries, and they have no access to public libraries. Yet their work brings its own reward, and they probably would not to-day exchange places with any one in the whole country.

5. It is an encouragement to know that such a praiseworthy movement is meeting with reasonable success. The plan is working well. Too much must not be expected at once, but enough appears already to sustain our faith and lead to still greater effort in the same direction.

(1.) The band has received everywhere a cordial welcome. Any suspicion that may have been felt in some quarters has been disarmed. It is hard to see how any one could help liking the new ministers, they are so fresh, so transparent, so sympathetic. We are not surprised to hear that a man who has not been a church-goer became so interested that he offered his horse and carriage to one of them to use whenever he wanted. And such favors are reported among them all.

(2.) The coöperative feature, which is the striking one in this experiment, strongly recommends it. Country places have long suffered for want of this. A single pastor, working only for his own parish, can do much; but he is always discouraged by a sense of his solitariness. He craves the counsel and companionship of his ministerial brethren; but they are scattered over wide areas, and cannot often come together. This need is provided for in the Andover scheme. The members of the band not only exchange pulpits, but they often have joint services, two or more of them appearing together at special meetings, which are proving very attractive to the public.

Some of them go in company to remote districts, and give the people there such meetings as they have not known before. They hold pleasant relations also with the ministers of other bodies, exchanging with them and uniting in various ways for the common good. The band has been instrumental in organizing a monthly reunion of the ministers of all denominations in the county. This has been held in Farmington thus far, and has proved helpful in many ways. It is an all-day meeting, and affords an opportunity for devotional exercises, reports, suggestions, papers, discussions, and good fellowship. A Methodist brother has been elected moderator.

(3.) Another proof of the success of the plan is that the Sunday services are improved. The element of worship is magnified and provision is made for a more general participation on the part of the congregation. The preaching is said to be simple and effective, designed to meet the everyday wants of the flock. Speculative and controversial themes are not introduced, but chiefly the fundamental and powerful truths which appeal to the heart and transform the life.

(4.) The Sunday-school and the weekly meetings feel the quickening of the new *régime*. They are better attended because better conducted. The Bible is made an object of careful and popular study, and, as a consequence, more teachers and helpers are forthcoming.

The constant effort of the band is to give the church an enlarged place in the community; to make it the central agency in every good work. Believing that it can purify and elevate all departments of human life, they seek to make it efficient, and to bring under its influence the young as well as the old, the farmer as well as the villager, the household as well as the congregation, the store as well as the dwelling, and the place of amusement as well as the sanctuary itself. May other bands arise to go and do likewise.

Edward G. Porter.

DORCHESTER, MASS.

MORALITY ON A SCIENTIFIC BASIS.

To the reader who is acquainted with the most prominent modern works on Ethics, such as those of Spencer, Stephen, Janet, and Gizycki, it is evident that the theory of morals is undergoing a process of radical reconstruction. Take up any of these works, or even note the attitude of popular writers and speakers in dealing with any question of right and wrong, and it is plain that we have come to a momentous crisis in the conception and treatment of morals. The old foundations of duty are gravely suspected, and the rising generation are very much at sea as to what are the proper principles by which they should govern their conduct. The chief agent in this unsettling of ethics, it needs hardly be said, is that same great theory that has already so disturbed or reconstructed most other branches of modern knowledge, — the theory of Evolution. That is a force that in every department to-day we must at least reckon with. And more than this: I am ready to admit that if the great laws of morality are to retain their hold upon modern men, they must be put, like all other laws, on a scientific basis; and if we put them on a scientific basis, we cannot fail to consider the bearing upon them of the principles of evolution.

To what extent, then, does evolution demand that we reconstruct our old conceptions of duty?

Mr. Spencer, in his two notable books, — the "Data of Ethics," and his recent volume on "Justice," — has presented us with his answer. Mr. Spencer's exposition of the morality which in his view evolution demands is indeed a very interesting, able, and significant work, and from his well-earned prestige as the most prominent expounder of evolution in our generation, has been regarded as presenting the legitimate outcome of that philosophy.

To many others, however, of the most intelligent expositors and most loyal disciples of that philosophy, Mr. Spencer's ethical expositions are very disappointing. I confess myself one of these. I adopt the general principle of evolution most heartily. But I cannot find Mr. Spencer's ethical theories satisfactory. They seem to me not only out of harmony with the facts of life and nature, and the needs of our social existence, but also out of harmony with the principles of evolution itself.

In the first place, Mr. Spencer errs by finding the moral quality of acts in their results, and making the principles of morality

variable quantities conditioned upon the environment. He fails to bear in mind that the moral quality is not in the outward act or its consequent pain or pleasure, but in the conscious feeling or motive of the person that is its source.

A second error is that the ultimate end and test of morals that he adopts, namely, happiness, is too indefinite and inconstant a thing to serve as the standard of right. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the demands and course of evolution itself. The ultimate end of any consistent system of evolutionary ethics ought to be one and the same with that toward which the universe is advancing, as it mounts step by step the staircase of cosmic progress. If happiness be that supreme end, then the increase of happiness and the unfolding stages of the cosmic evolution ought to go together, step by step. But in point of fact they do not thus keep step. Here, one runs ahead; there, the other. And if at the higher rounds of evolution there is much more pleasure than at the lower, there is also just as much more pain. Every forward step of vital and conscious development has its beginning and price in a painful rupture of the preceding harmony and ease. Where there is the highest evolution of humanity, we do not find a life supremely happy, but rather one nobly discontented with itself. If happiness be the ultimate end and proper moral aim of man, why does evolution carry him away from it, or at least pay little or no attention to it?

Thirdly. The explanation which Mr. Spencer presents of the origin of conscience and the sense of duty is inconsistent with itself and with our moral consciousness. The moral instincts are far older than those political, penal, and ecclesiastical restraints by whose influence Mr. Spencer supposes them to have been developed. There is nothing in the generality, the lateness of date, or the remote and diffused effects of truth, justice, and honesty, to supply a satisfactory explanation of the authority and sanction of these ideas. That explanation is found more simply and clearly in the ease, directness, and certainty with which our moral reason perceives the quality of rightness in them.

Fourthly. The metamorphic origin of conscience, and the ill-iveness of the authority of moral ideas, which Mr. Spencer supposes, would destroy the sanction and binding power of duty, and is fraught with the gravest danger to society, if generally adopted.

We are brought, then, face to face with a grave question. Shall we therefore, because of the truth of evolution, admit duty and intuitive right to be but illusions,—echoes of ancestral

alarms and pressures; self-interest in disguise; or, on the contrary, shall we, in the name of sacred duty, erect at the boundary line of ethics a sign, inscribed with solemn interdict to the advancing flood of evolution: "Hitherto shalt thou come and no further, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed"?

Now, I believe that neither of these courses would be either wise or even feasible. If evolution has no seat of authority to grant to morals, then it is evident that there is some fatal defect somewhere in that theory; and it will fail to maintain permanently its hold over the heart of humanity.

On the other hand, I am not so simple as to think that I, or any other critic of the present day, can play the part of Canute to this steadily rising tide of the evolution philosophy. Nor do I wish to, for I believe in it, as the theory of the world's origin most probably true; and I have no doubt that it is a law ruling and applicable in the field of morals as much as in botany or zoölogy.

We need, therefore, to adopt a more excellent way; and that is, to study independently the law of evolution and what it requires in the realm of morals. Let us employ that principle, not in a fashion partial, inappropriate, and inconsistent with itself, but let us use it logically and thoroughly; and then, I believe, we shall find in evolution itself a solid basis for morals, an honorable origin for conscience, a wholesome and elevated standard of right, and a noble and inspiring end for our moral efforts.

Let us reëxamine the law of evolution and the other great laws of the universe which modern science has established, and see if they do not present ample grounds for a solid and rational system of morality.

Candid scrutiny of the nature of happiness (which is the ultimate end and test of right and wrong presented by the Spencian ethics) shows it to be low in its grade, shifty, dangerous, and unavailable as an immediate guide for conduct, and inconsistent with the law of evolution itself. But is this the only or most appropriate end to which evolution points? Let us turn and look at the law of Evolution itself, and see what it has, in truth, to suggest as the aim and end of our being.

What is its most conspicuous feature? Is it not its constant upward tendency? The universe has been steadily progressing from the inanimate to the animate; from the sentient to the rational; from the impersonal to the personal. This constant ascent of life is regarded by Darwin as a result of the selection by Nature of the higher form better adapted to succeed in the struggle

of life. By Spencer, it is explained as an effect of the natural adaptation of the vital forces to an improved environment.

But on either theory we have to suppose an original expansive power in the vital forces, — ready, like an elastic gas, to rush in and improve every opportunity for larger life. Now this, indeed, is the very characteristic of life, that, wherever it is healthy, it possesses a superabundant fecundity, and is ever overflowing and begetting new life. The more it assimilates and acquires, the more it produces and multiplies. There is always, therefore, in living things a pressure toward larger and higher existence. Below the stage of humanity, the more noticeable thing is the increasing perfection of the physical organism. But even in the animal kingdom, every higher organized species shows an increase in the rational element, progressive penetration and saturation of flesh by spirit, moulding the organism more perfectly to higher ends; and when in man, the flexible hands and the erect attitude are reached and the climax of the bodily evolution seems to be attained, then the material and bodily progress gives place to an inward one. Thought and love, as they unfold so marvelously, carry man up to the heights of the spiritual life. And as the vital evolution thus reaches its climax in this splendid efflorescence of the spiritual activities, these higher qualities of the soul are recognized as superior to all that has preceded. As far as mere happiness goes, there may not be much gain, as we progress from the mollusk to the man. But in amplitude and intensity of consciousness, whether it be of pain or pleasure, in the elevation of the personal life, with its deeper emotions and clearer thought, the gain has been immense. The more we study the long story of evolution, the more we see that the thing which it has had at heart is to bring forth consciousness; to bring it forth in greatest fullness and harmonious development. All our thirst for possessions, our lower ambitions for place, power, success, are but the temporary scaffoldings, the unconscious and providential servants of this higher end. The more we better our outward life, the more clearly we see that it is of no value unless we better our inward life and improve ourselves. The man's ideal of how he may make the best of himself, and all his efforts to do so, may be at first very crude. But they keep him moving upward, and unless he strives after this fulfillment of all that becomes a man, he feels himself in woeful debt to that creative source that has endowed him with his higher faculties. Unless he improves and utilizes his nature to its highest possibilities, the spectacle of his

wasted life is a spectacle of inconsistency and inequity that violates the unities of the universe, arousing the spectator to condemnation and the perpetrator to remorse.

Any moral and rational being is therefore bound to aim at the development of his spiritual personality—his true being—to the fullest, noblest, and highest life possible.

But is this self-perfection the ultimate end of human duty? If so, is it not a very selfish aim?

It would be, if sought alone. But its fundamental condition is that it cannot be successfully gained alone. A second great lesson of the law of evolution, equally important in its bearing on the principles of morals, is the solidarity of life. Through the great laws of descent and inheritance, all the generations of life are bound together in a continuous vital chain. In the light of modern science, humanity is one vast organism; and each individual a cell in the social tissue into which he was born. As the habits, efforts, and even ideals of the youth live in the man, so the thoughts and deeds, the faithfulness or negligence, of our ancestors live in the spiritual life of to-day; and ours shall live in the victories or disappointments of posterity. We have no more a right than we have a possibility of living to ourselves alone or for the present, independent of the past and the future. We are bound, in our moral decisions, to weigh our actions and motives with regard to their influence on the elevation or depression of the human race as a whole. The supreme and ultimate end of moral action, therefore, is the evolution of the completest and highest soul-life of humanity; not that of one individual cell or personal nerve of the body politic; but the great all-connected organism of our social life; lifting it up to higher life, not merely in outward comfort and efficiency, but much more in the realms of higher spiritual perfection, in heart and head and conscience. Those motives are morally good which thus tend to elevate humanity; those bad, which impede or degrade this spiritual development of our race. This is not a standard (as Mr. Spencer has admitted that of happiness to be), which must be set aside practically throughout a large part of conduct; but it is one that can everywhere be safely and advantageously applied.

Now, of course, it is evident, that all things are not equally conducive to this development of the higher life of humanity. Those which are antagonistic should be suppressed; those which contribute little should be restrained or subordinated. Whenever there comes a conflict (as is usual in cases of moral decision

or perplexity), there the law of morality is to sacrifice the lower to the higher. The right is not so much a fixed formula as the constant choice of the higher alternative, most promotive of humanity's spiritual progress, over the lower alternative, which impedes it. And it is evident, how, without any change of its principle of decision, morality may yet, at different levels of civilization, dictate quite different outward acts, because of their different relation and bearing on the ultimate end (ever the same) of the elevation of our race and the perfection of our spiritual being. That variation in outward conduct and specific acts which moral codes show in different social conditions is, from this point of view, not a reproach to morality, but the wise diversity of the moral consciousness, ever constant in its purpose and principle, in best realizing its ideal. And, moreover, when we adopt this nobler standard of the right, the fact that an act involves with it some pain does not make it thereby in a certain measure wrong, as Mr. Spencer holds; but pain itself is recognized as one of the chief and most valuable educational forces in developing the spiritual consciousness of our race.

Again, let us look for ourselves and see what evolution and science have to tell us about the origin of duty and disinterestedness. In point of fact, were the primitive instincts of man wholly egoistic? Was his normal state that of a free fight, each against all? Is it only by political and ecclesiastical coercions, by social and industrial pressures, and the magic chemistry of heredity, that these experiences of selfish utility have been transformed into our moral instincts and intuitions?

This is not the teaching of science. It is an error, due not to tracing man's genealogy back too far, but not far enough.

Spencer and Lubbock and their school go back to the imbruted savage of Africa or Australia and say, Thus selfish and blood-thirsty and thoroughly immoral was the state of primitive man. But this is inverting the real sequence of cause and effect. It is not civilization that produces the moral nature, but the moral nature that generates civilization; and it is precisely because such tribes have been deficient in average moral quality that they have failed to march upward on the path of civilization with the rest of mankind, and have switched off, instead, into these blind alleys of degradation. Natural history shows us that peaceful and well ordered society does not have to wait for the later man, nor even the first man, before it could come into existence. It existed ages before man, and in ranks of life far below the scale

of humanity. Among the bees, the ants, the beavers, the hundreds of different animal species that live together in communities, peaceful society exists in forms so highly developed as to excite the astonishment of all who have studied them. No animal, indeed, exists alone as a solitary individual. From the lowest to the highest, the social environment is the condition of the renewal of existence and successful continuance of life.

And as peaceful and well organized society did not begin with man, so neither altruism nor the moral instincts had their first beginning with him. It may be, as is charged, that no creature, however high in the scale, is absolutely unselfish. But I may retort with equal truth, no creature, however low, is absolutely selfish. For even to perpetuate the species, there must come into play sexual and parental instincts whose outreach is far greater and higher than self. The solitary species whose members mutually prey on one another are as a rule the species whose members are small, that are dying out. The animal species that are large and numerous are those that are gregarious, and wherever they are gregarious, there they are found (as with the migratory birds, the bands of seal, buffalo, prairie dogs, and monkeys, the communities of beetles, ants and wasps), giving more or less mutual aid to one another; an aid that is a most essential element of their success in the struggle of existence.

Natural science thus shows that it is not individual self-seeking, but social coöperation, that is the more effective factor in evolution.

And, moreover, this social life is itself conditioned upon the instinctive altruism, the rudimentary moral sense of the species. All naturalists who have studied gregarious groups have noticed among them not merely instincts of mutual helpfulness, but a sense of personal rights and the duty of just dealing with their fellow-members in the group, as instincts more or less developed. In the villages of the prairie dogs and beavers, each has its own resting-place which the others respect. So with the sparrows and crows, on returning from their migrations; and if a lazy sparrow tries to appropriate the nest which a comrade is building, the whole flock will interfere to punish the lazy comrade.

Even in the animal kingdom, then, the moral sense, in a rudimentary form, exists. It is what keeps all social groups from falling to pieces, and promotes their upward evolution.

And when we reach the human sphere, what else characterizes it than the greater restriction of the selfish impulses by the grow-

ing sense of justice and sympathy in the community? What else makes tribes the fittest to survive than the soundness and strength of their moral nature, — the courage, temperance, virtue and loyalty of its members? These are, in fact, inherent conditions of social welfare; while their opposites — licentiousness, drunkenness, cowardice, laziness, lack of patriotism — are inherent discords and violations of our normal social relations.

It is evident, then, that our intuitions of justice and benevolence are far older than those political restraints, awe of ancestral ghosts, or calculations of utility in which Mr. Spencer would find their beginning. They are rather the uprisings into consciousness and into activity of the stable laws of social and progressive life; they are the natural manifestation of that expansive tendency, that constant overflow of life beyond the bounds of self, and commingling of its being and efforts with that of its fellows, which characterizes life itself wherever it is healthily active. The richest life always shows itself that which most tends to lavish itself and share its own with others. The impulses of disinterestedness, the outgoings of sympathy and largess, are therefore nothing artificial, nothing late and adventitious; but as native to human existence as it is for the mother of a newborn child to give her milk to the babe.

That the moral nature of man has grown up from very crude beginnings, I do not, of course, deny. But I contend that it has not been manufactured out of purely sensational or unmoral elements; but it has grown from a genuinely moral germ, and has become a clear vision of genuinely moral laws and relations. If no creative fiat can be believed to have created something out of nothing, when the world first began, still less is evolution able to perform such a contradiction. The moral fruits that humanity produces require a moral germ at the start; this is required, even on the theory of evolution itself. For if the moral sense has been developed by natural selection, preserving and unfolding the good, then the good must have been already there, at least in embryo, to be thus chosen and ripened.

Now, there is no tribe of savages so degraded as not to exhibit such rudimentary moral traits. The most careful examination in this field that has been made is undoubtedly that of C. Staniland Wake, in his "Evolution of Morality." And he finds everywhere, even in the most barbarous tribes, a sense of right. This manifests itself not only as a sense of the right to his own life which the savage feels, — a right shown by the indignant passion with

which he defends it, — but also as a feeling of right to the game he has caught, the weapons he has made, the skins in which he clothes himself, and the cave or lair in which he sleeps. This sense of right to a man's own life and the fruit of his personal efforts, no doubt goes back to the very beginning of man's career as man; for even in his Darwinian cousins, the apes, and in animals far lower in the scale, it already exists. Witness the bird's sense of lawful claim to its nest; the beast to its den; the dog to his bone.

But is not all this, it may be asked, a form of selfishness? And can we explain the transition from this claim for one's own to that respect for others' rights which constitutes justice and morality (in any proper sense) by any other forces than by such hereditary fears and political and ecclesiastical restraints as Mr. Spencer has suggested?

On the contrary, this primitive indignation, which so often far transcends the bounds of prudence or policy, moves already on a higher plane than that of selfish interest, and it expands to impersonal amplitude by a much quicker and simpler method than by that soft solder of alarms and experienced utilities to which Mr. Spencer resorts. For as plainly as we cannot have two adjacent hills without a valley between them, so the logical corollary of my own right is, first, a corresponding duty in myself to maintain that right, and secondly, a corresponding duty in my neighbor to respect it. And as reason develops to form general notions of man as man, of right as right, the sense of right belonging to one's self would be extended to one's family, tribe and nation. Whatever encroachment was regarded as a wrong when directed against one's self would, by mental generalization, be also looked on as a wrong when directed against a fellow-tribesman. And next, as reason developed, it would be seen, that, to be consistent, we should respect these rights even against ourselves; and in obedience to the duty we owe to others, we should restrain our own desires when they injure our neighbor. If those we are dealing with are men like ourselves, and we are members of one social order with them, then the claims we make upon them for the security of our own rights become the measure of our own obligations, in similar circumstances. This is the self-evident equation demanded by the impartial reason. And therefore, as reason develops and the sensibility with its selfish tendencies loses its earlier predominance over human nature, man looks at both conduct and character from an impersonal standpoint; reciprocity,

that Golden Rule of morals, becomes an intuitive law of social intercourse; and morality enlarges its sway beyond all personal and tribal limitations till it recognizes all mankind as one family, each possessed of equal rights, and bound together in universal relations.

And now we may consider that critical question in ethics, — what sanction or binding power over man has duty? What is the source of the authority of righteousness, — or has it, indeed, any real authority? In the Spencerian system of ethics, as we saw, the sense of duty possessed only an illusive independence. It is an echo of our ancestors' varied dreads and the social restraints by which humanity has been tied down, till these restraints have become a second nature. We follow duty, because it is, on the whole, more conducive to happiness, — special and general. Such is Mr. Spencer's teaching.

But such sanctions are but mere ropes of sand. We need more binding ties, a more authoritative command, if the sense of duty is not to vanish from the earth as fast as such views spread abroad; and vanish, too, without waiting for that perfectly evolved man, who, Mr. Spencer tells us, will no longer need it. Can evolution or science supply such a basis and authority? I believe it does. We need only to look at that great law, the solidarity of the universe; the vital unity of life, in view of which Mr. Spencer has called his system of thought the Synthetic Philosophy. Life on earth forms a continuous whole; humanity is one great vital organism, where the interests of the individual and the community are inseparable. Egoistic pleasure is an illusion. I can reap no pleasure separate from that of others. Our social relations form therefore an intermeshed network, a vibrant vital tissue. These intimate relations are realities, and out of them naturally arise all those common rights and duties, which must be recognized in order that the social organism may work normally and healthily. The moral law is seated in the very structure of the universe, for it is the natural concord which manifests the unity of being, and is as indispensable to social existence as the force of gravitation to the continuance of the planetary system. The moral necessity that man feels is but the full-blown blossom in our spiritual consciousness of this sacred unity and natural bond, — a bond, one and the same in essence with that which swings the planets in punctual rhythm round the sun and bends the mother's head in love and helpfulness over the cradle of her newborn babe.

This idea of the right is one undecomposable and unique. It

pronounces not what is or may be, but what must be; and if cold facts oppose it, it retorts, "So much the worse for the facts. If life is spared me, I will change those facts; and if I die in the effort, my martyr-blood shall found a new social order where that which ought to be, shall be." Its worth and authority is superior to either individual or social happiness. Before the tribunal of righteousness, the iniquity on which a comfortable majority fattens is none the less an iniquity. To a true man, — yes, even to the man who theoretically resolves duty into a mere evolution of the laws of comfort, as Professor Huxley does, — truth and right have a higher claim than any considerations of general welfare. For was it not this eminent scientist and professed Utilitarian himself who said: "Suppose theology established the existence of an evil deity (and some theologians, even Christian ones, have come very near this), is the religious affection to be transferred from the ethical ideal to any such omnipotent demon? I trow not. Better a thousand times that the human race should perish under his thunderbolts than that it should say, 'Evil, be thou my good.'"

These are the instinctive sentiments of every heart that has discerned the sanctity of the moral ideal, and they plainly exhibit its superior authority to all calculation of the surplus of pleasure. The sovereignty of duty is a sovereignty as eternal and inherent as it is unbought.

Of course, the crudeness of man's early moral perceptions, and the long process of development through which they have been moulded, must be admitted. But must we say, therefore, that their testimony is untrustworthy and their sovereignty an illusion? One might as well say that the grape is not to be reckoned sweet, or the rose beautiful, because they began their life as bitter, unsightly buds. One might as well say that the vision of our eyes is not trustworthy because these optic organs were developed from inferior and imperfect organs, and the first rudiment of an eye that appeared on the stage of life was hardly worthy to be called an eye at all. There is a senseless skepticism that doubts all knowledge, because it accepts no objective realities. But it has been the precise work of modern science to vindicate the objective reality of things, and with it, the trustworthiness of our faculties. It is because the air and its undulations exist and act upon us, that they call the special organs of hearing into existence, and mould them into harmony with the laws of acoustics. It is because there are actual physical relations between extended things, that there have been developed in us the intuitive mathe-

matic and geometric laws of space and matter, whose relations and properties they express.

So it is because there are actual moral forces, — pressing upon and moulding man, certain objective moral relations in the midst of which he is set, — that his moral vision has perceived and affirmed these laws. The moral forces and conditions precede and mould society and awake the latent ethical sense, just as the magnetic forces group in symmetric forms the iron filings scattered on a paper held over a magnet. As we recognize our union for good or ill with our fellows, and that reason and honor both require us in self-consistency to give to others whatever rights we claim from them, justice and love become our sovereign laws. Man finds himself a part of a moral universe in which he has grown up; an inseparable part of a great organic web, by whose vital forces his moral nature has been moulded.

The power that manifests itself in the universe about us (and equally the power that rules within us) is a power that makes for righteousness. Vice and injustice ever go to pieces and to annihilation before it. The social life and the sympathetic forces gain steadily upon the isolated and the selfish life, so that the union of man with man, and of humanity with all the rest of creation, steadily increases. The shining ideals of beauty, truth, and virtue draw us upward and onward, toward the goal of an ever-enlarging perfection ahead of us.

The infinite world-organism is the body and manifestation of God. The laws of that whole, then, are the eternal laws of God. Under the reiterated impressions of that world-life in which we are environed, and with the clarified vision of truth that is given where the impartial mind begins to look out on the world, the inherent principles of the universal reason reflect themselves in the mirror of the human reason.

As the plastic tablets of the human heart vitally react to the constantly repeated imprints of the righteous cosmic life, the great, eternal laws of that divine essence emerge at length in human consciousness as moral instincts and intuitions. Our higher aspirations have such spontaneous authority because they are revelations of our deepest needs and most essential nature; the prophetic voice of that destiny of which we are still, for the most part, unconscious. Morality is the victory of the divine life in us, "the inward sovereign spirit of the universe that has ever moved onward from chaos to cosmos, from lifelessness to life, from the outer to the inner." Whenever we do a right action we

unite ourselves with that great tide which sweeps through eternity, through which every star keeps its orbit, every cell has its appointed place and honor, and the "most ancient heavens are fresh and strong."

Through this universal unity all parts of the great world and all its varied events, every obedient member of its great whole, are bound together into an orderly interdependent divine life. This is what furnishes the scientific foundation of ethics; and it is the instinctive feeling of this vital and eternal solidarity of our life with the universal life which gives our sense of obligation its transcendent sacredness.

In the name, then, not only of religion, but of science itself, we may affirm a supreme authority for duty, and may look upon the enlightened conscience as the expression, in the human soul, of the divine righteousness and love. A candid examination of evolution and the constitution of nature and society does not overthrow Duty, but restores to her her sceptre and lawful sovereignty over human life. The true aim of human life (which is therefore also the true standard of morals) is nothing less than the closest possible approximation we can reach to such a moral and intellectual perfection as is exhibited in the being from whom we emanate.

Evolution from the lower to the higher, from the carnal to the spiritual, is not merely the path of man's past pilgrimage, but the destiny to which the future calls him; for it is the path which brings his spirit into closest resemblance and most intimate union with the divine essence itself.

It is to this, nothing lower than this, that both morality and religion summon man. It is to this that the divine spirit itself, — not merely by these high yearnings after perfection which distinguish the chosen of our race, — but alike by that common instinct for the betterment of our life which is the condition of all material progress, — it is, I say, to this resemblance to the divine and intimate union with Him that that Holy Spirit itself summons us. For this instinct for the improvement and perfection of our life (whether in its material or its spiritual form) is the abiding witness in man of that Infinite Spirit which is ever educating higher from lower, and better from worse, in infinite progression.

James T. Bixby.

YONKERS, N. Y.

EDITORIAL.

THE CASE OF PROFESSOR SMITH.

THE prosecution of Professor Briggs in the Presbytery of New York was followed up in the Presbytery of Cincinnati by the prosecution, on similar charges, of Dr. Henry P. Smith, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Lane Theological Seminary.¹

At a meeting of the Presbytery held on Feb. 16, 1891, resolutions were introduced condemning Professor Briggs's inaugural address, and calling on the General Assembly shortly to convene in Detroit to "take such action as shall in its judgment be best adapted to preserve the peace, purity, and prosperity of the Church." The resolutions were referred to a committee, and reported at an adjourned meeting on March 2.

This overture gave rise to a discussion which was not confined to the parliamentary question, but ranged over the whole subject of Scripture and inspiration, and ran on for several weeks in the meetings of the Presbyterian Ministerial Association. In the course of this discussion papers were read by Professor Llewelyn J. Evans, who filled the New Testament chair in Lane Seminary, and — at the special request of the Association — by Professor Smith. These papers were published together under the title, "*Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*."² The aim of the writers, as defined by Professor Evans, was "to present some of the accepted conclusions of the best Christian scholarship of the day respecting certain features of our sacred Scriptures, as these conclusions bear on the question of the inspiration, infallibility, and authority of these Scriptures, and on the rights and obligations of those who are appointed to direct the study of them in our theological schools."

Professor Evans makes very clear the nature of the "irrepressible conflict" in the Presbyterian Church. On the one side are the facts which the critical study of the Bible brings to light, and which are admitted without reserve or scruple by nearly all scholars; on the other, a definition of inspiration and an *a priori* theory of Scripture framed by theologians without any reference to the facts or concern about them. If that were all, the scholars and the theologians might go their several ways in peace; but the theologians insist on identifying their theories with the doctrine of the Confession of Faith and imposing them, under its authority, upon scholars. As the conscience of the truth forbids the latter to accept these terms, conflict is unavoidable. Professor Evans quotes Pro-

¹ This was less than a month after the address was delivered (Jan. 20), and actually before it was published!

² *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*. Two papers by Llewelyn J. Evans and Henry Preserved Smith. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1891. Third edition, with preface and appendix containing two articles on "Ordination Vows," by Professor Smith; also the Charges and Specifications presented to the Presbytery of Cincinnati by the Committee of Prosecution. 1892.

fessor A. A. Hodge's "Commentary on the Confession of Faith," in which he makes the Confession teach that the books of Scripture "are one and all, in thought and verbal expression, in substance and in form, wholly the Word of God, conveying with absolute accuracy and divine authority all that God meant them to convey, without human additions or admixtures;" and that everything written under the influence of inspiration "is the very Word of God, of infallible truth and divine authority; and this infallibility and authority attach as well to the verbal expression in which the revelation is conveyed as to the matter of the revelation itself." In the words of Professors Hodge and Warfield,¹ "The historical faith of the church has always been that all the affirmations of the Scripture of all kinds, whether of spiritual doctrine, or duty, or of physical or historical fact, or of psychological or philosophical principle, are without any error when the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense."

This statement, as Professor Evans says, gives the key to the situation. "It is the premise from which have proceeded all the movements in our church which have been directed, during the past ten years, against the affirmations of modern Biblical criticism. The critics have found that statement of inspiration impossible. Therefore their conclusions have been denounced as dangerous, rationalistic, or worse." He protests against this *a priori* method of disposing of a question of fact, as unscientific, irreverent, and presumptuous. He shows that the formula breaks down when we try to apply it to a concrete case like that of the Synoptic Gospels, and that it is contradicted by plain facts which lie on the surface of the New Testament. His own conception of the nature of inspiration is drawn from Paul's words in 1 Cor. ii. 6-16, "the clearest, the fullest, the profoundest treatment of the subject that has ever been given."

Professor Smith begins his paper with a brief review of theories of inspiration which have been held among Jews and Christians. He shows that the pressure of an extreme theory of inspiration was not seriously felt as long as the allegorical method of interpretation provided a ready escape from its difficulties. It is the combination of the historico-critical exegesis with the theories of inspiration developed by the Protestant scholastics of the seventeenth century and their spiritual descendants that is intolerable. He then puts these theories, as represented by the article of Professors Hodge and Warfield cited above, to the test of facts in the Old Testament in various ways, — for example, by comparing the Chronicles with the books of Samuel and Kings. That the result is something very different from "inerrancy" it is needless to say.

The attitude of both the authors in questions of Biblical criticism is conservative. They firmly believe in supernatural revelation and the

¹ *Presbyterian Review*, ii. (1881) p. 238.

inspiration of the Scriptures, and receive them as "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." Their papers are conceived in an admirable spirit, modest though positive, full of reverence for the Bible and of respect for the opinions and feelings of those who differ from them; they have nothing of the note of challenge which sometimes rings harshly in Professor Briggs's address. If it is legitimate to discuss the question at all, it is hard to see how this side of it could be presented in a more judicious, temperate, and conciliatory way. But the offense of the facts they could not do away or deny.

The controversy went on. Its grim earnestness was relieved by at least one ludicrous episode. Professor Roberts, the Stated Clerk of the General Assembly and Professor of Practical Theology in the seminary, undertook with a magisterial air to set his Biblical colleagues straight about the "four hundred and thirty years" in Galatians iii. 7, and, *obiter*, about the Old Testament text, versions, and criticism in general.¹ The suddenness with which Professor Evans stripped off the lion's skin from beneath which proceeded these sonorous roars against the critics was bewildering. By a liberal use of parallel columns he proved that Professor Roberts had simply reproduced the arguments of Colenso; and, again in parallel columns, employed Green's reply to Colenso to demolish them.² As Professor Roberts had been holding Professor Green up to his colleagues as the oracle of Old Testament scholarship, his discomfiture may be imagined. A severer castigation has seldom been inflicted; and never was one better deserved.

Most of the disputants — especially after this misadventure — kept on safer ground, and argued with great iteration and emphasis that the idea of inspiration necessarily involves the infallibility of Scripture; a proposition which, inasmuch as they defined inspiration as the influence or superintendence which secures infallibility, they had no difficulty in proving — by the naked *petitio principii*! More and more the question narrowed itself to the possibility of error in the "*ipsissima verba* of the original autographs."

The discussion had begun in the Presbytery; it was taken back into the Presbytery by the introduction of resolutions "on erroneous teaching in theological seminaries" whose general phrases had a well understood particular application; and the appointment of a committee to investigate the matter.³ The committee consisted exclusively of men who had been outspoken in their condemnation of the position of the Lane professors, — the moderator explaining in the most simple-minded way that he made it up thus, because if different opinions had been represented there would have been majority and minority reports and no end of trouble. This committee did what was expected of it, recommending that the

¹ *Cincinnati Commercial Gazette*, April 11, 1891.

² *Commercial Gazette*, April 18, 1891.

³ December 21, 1891.

Presbytery institute judicial proceedings against Professor Smith,¹ — Professor Evans having in the mean time accepted a call to a college in Wales. A committee of prosecution consisting of the Rev. William McKibbin, D. D., the Rev. Thomas O. Lowe, and Ruling Elder D. H. Shields, was accordingly appointed (Sept. 21, 1892) to prepare charges and try the case.

The charges, which were brought in on the 17th of October, 1892, were three in number.² In the first he is accused of teaching in two articles in the "New York Evangelist" that a minister of the Presbyterian Church "may abandon the essential features of the system of doctrine held by said Church, and which he received and adopted at his ordination, and rightfully retain his position as a minister in said Church."³ In the incriminated articles, Professor Smith discussed the delicate question of the obligations and rights of Presbyterian ministers under their subscription to the Westminster standards, arguing that the American church in adopting those symbols did not intend to enforce doctrinal uniformity, but only to secure adhesion to the Scriptural system of doctrine exhibited in them; and that what is essential to that system of doctrine, or, to put it in another way, the limits of allowable divergence of opinion within the church, can be determined only by judicial decision, the church courts having no power to interpret the organic law in any other way. He contended, further, that it is not only the right but the duty of a minister who believes himself to be within those limits to remain in the church until, by constitutional methods, it decides otherwise. He said nothing which could by any process short of sheer perversion be construed into an assertion that a minister may "abandon the essential features of the system of doctrine" and stay in the church.

This would seem to be a sound and honorable position, especially in a time when the standards are under revision, and when their consistent and logical Calvinism is openly and vehemently repudiated by not a few distinguished leaders of the church; but so it did not appear to the prosecution, who accused Professor Smith all the more loudly that they did not know just what to accuse him of, some making his offense dishonesty or teaching dishonesty, some disloyalty to the church, some undermining the order and discipline of the church, some disturbing its peace and purity.

The other charges deal with the subject of Scripture and inspiration.

¹ The report of the committee was postponed in consequence of the illness and death of Professor Smith's son, and his own absence in Europe, until Sept. 20, 1892.

² Printed in an appendix to *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*, third edition, 1892, pp. 134-139; and, as finally amended by the Presbytery, in *Response, Rejoinder, and Argument*, etc., 1893, pp. 161-165. See at the end of this article, pp. 228-230.

³ "How much is implied in Ordination Vows?" *Evangelist*, March 17, 1892; "The Sin of Schism," *ib.*, April 7, 1892. Reprinted in an appendix to the third edition of *Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration*, pp. 126-134.

The second accuses Professor Smith of teaching, in the pamphlet, "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," "that the Holy Spirit did not so control the inspired writers in their composition of the Holy Scriptures as to make their utterances absolutely truthful; *i. e.*, free from error when interpreted in their natural and intended sense." The third charges him "while alleging that the Holy Scriptures are inspired, and an infallible rule of faith and practice, with denying in fact their inspiration, in the sense in which inspiration is attributed to the Holy Scriptures, by the Holy Scriptures themselves and by the Confession of Faith." These two charges cover substantially the same ground, for inspiration in the sense in which the committee uses the term is nothing else than the influence which insures immunity from error, so that the denial of the effect involves the denial of the cause and *vice versa*.

The tacit identification of modern theories of inspiration with the teaching of Scripture and the doctrine of the Confession which here appears, is strikingly illustrated in the wording of the second charge, in which a qualifying clause from Hodge and Warfield's article, — "when interpreted in their natural and intended sense," — is introduced into the statement of "a fundamental doctrine of the Word of God and of the Confession of Faith." The same thing was demonstrated at every turn in the arguments of the prosecutors. It would not be an unfair inference from their own presentation that Professor Smith was put on trial for differing from these two theologians.

Professor Smith made his response to the charges on November 14 and 15, objecting to their sufficiency in form and legal effect.¹ After a long argument he was overruled on every point, and with slight amendments to the wording of two or three of the specifications, the trial proceeded. The gravamen of the indictment lay in the second charge. This was based chiefly, as the specifications show, upon Professor Smith's exhibition of the way in which the author of the Chronicles dealt with his sources in the old historical books. The facts which he adduced were beyond controversy, — even the prosecution did not dispute them; they were but a small part of the great volume of evidence bearing on the historical character of the Chronicles with which all scholars are familiar, and which three times at least in the present century has been massed in overwhelming force. Professor Smith's interpretation of the facts was the most favorable that can be conceived; he thinks it possible to explain them all without impugning the good faith of the author or calling in question his inspiration. But instead of being grateful for this apology the prosecutors turn upon Professor Smith and read

¹ *Response of Henry Preserved Smith to the Charges presented to the Presbytery of Cincinnati by the Committee of Prosecution. With Rejoinder to the Committee's Reply.* Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1892. — *Response, Rejoinder, and Argument.* With the Judgment of the Court in the matter of the Charges against the Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1893.

him. They accuse him of teaching "that the inspired author of Chronicles has been guilty of asserting¹ sundry errors of historic fact," "that he has been guilty of suppressing¹ sundry historic truths, owing to inability or unwillingness to believe them," and — worst of all — "that the historical unreliability of the inspired author of Chronicles was so great that the truth of history therein contained can only be discovered by such investigation, discrimination, and sifting as is necessary to the discovery of the truth in histories by uninspired and fallible men." The orthodox doctrine opposed to this heresy would seem to be that from a reliable source, above all from an inspired one, the truth of history may be learned without investigation, discrimination, and sifting, — a most comfortable doctrine, surely.

The prosecution, we have said, did not deny that there are discrepancies between the Chronicles and the Kings, but "they can be accounted for upon the supposition of error in transmission." It is not strange that this seemed to the Rev. Mr. Lowe, a lawyer who entered the ministry somewhat late in life and without any theological education, as it does to many who have not the same excuse, a ready and sufficient solution of the difficulty. An English clergyman in India once tried to prove to Macaulay that Bonaparte was the Beast of the Revelation, because his name, written in Arabic with the omission of only two letters, gave 666; and when Macaulay objected that the computation should have been based on the Greek rather than Arabic, gravely told him that "Everybody knows that the Greek letters were never used to mark numbers." With his meekest look and voice Macaulay replied: "I do not think everybody knows that. Indeed, I have reason to believe that a different opinion — erroneous, no doubt — is universally embraced by all the small minority who happen to know any Greek." The opinion of Mr. Lowe about what may be accounted for by transcriptional error is worth just as much as that of Macaulay's clergyman about the numerical value of the Greek letters; the opposite opinion is universally embraced by all the exceedingly small minority who happen to know anything about text criticism as applied to the Old Testament.

Professor Smith made a good defense; but he could not deny that his opinions were in irreconcilable conflict with the new dogma of infallibility — the "inerrancy" of the "*ipsissima verba* of the original autographs." Upon that issue he was really tried, and his conviction was a foregone conclusion. Every step in the conduct of the case showed how strong was the prejudice against him. The only wonder is that the majority in the final vote was not larger. On the first charge he was acquitted; on the second and third he was convicted by majorities of eighteen and six respectively.²

¹ The Presbytery amended, "has asserted," and "has suppressed."

² The vote was: on Charge II., to sustain, 36; to sustain in part, 2; not to sustain, 20: on Charge III., to sustain, 32; not to sustain, 26.

The prosecution demanded nothing less than deposition; but the Presbytery, influenced no doubt by the personal respect in which Professor Smith is generally held, contented itself with suspending him from the ministry until he should recant.¹ From this decision the defendant appealed to the Synod of Ohio, which meets in October next.

Professor Smith at once reported to the Trustees of the Seminary that he had been suspended by the Presbytery, and tendered them his resignation. At a meeting held on January 31, 1893, the Trustees declined to accept the resignation pending the trial of his appeal, but relieved him of teaching until his appeal shall be decided; requesting him, however, to continue to give instruction till the end of the current Seminary year. It is well understood that a strong majority of the Trustees firmly support Professor Smith; indeed, a much more radical motion, which would have led to the withdrawal of the Seminary from the control of the Assembly, was only defeated by the apprehension that it would prejudice Professor Smith's appeal. At the same time the Chair of Practical Theology was abolished on the ground that the income of the Seminary is insufficient to support so many professorships; the duties of the chair being distributed among the remaining instructors. The reason given for the action is perfectly valid; but it would be an injustice to the Trustees not to believe that the conduct of the incumbent, Professor Roberts, during the proceedings against his colleague, had a good deal to do with their decision. There are virtues more fundamental than orthodoxy.

It is clear from the stand of the Trustees that the influence which has so long been potent in that body, and has been a constant menace to the progress of the Seminary, is no longer in the ascendant. In this all friends of the Seminary will rejoice.

The trial of Professor Smith shows, even more clearly than that of Professor Briggs, the determination of a strong party in the Presbyterian Church that there shall henceforth be room in it for only one way of thinking on the questions of Biblical criticism and inspiration, namely, the Princeton way. The situation is in this respect exactly parallel to that which preceded the disruption of the church in 1837. But there is this important difference; the Old-School men of that time could maintain with some show of reason that their shibboleths were in the Confession of Faith: the "original autographs" are not only not in the Confession, — the theory is a subterfuge invented to evade the plain words of the Confession. The attempt to force all Presbyterian ministers to frame to pronounce aright these barbarous test words must result in division again. Whether it shall come to that, depends very much on the wisdom and the grace of the General Assembly which meets in Washington in May.

¹ Dec. 13. The judgment is printed in *Response, Rejoinder, and Argument*, p. 166.

THE CHARGES AGAINST PROFESSOR SMITH.

(AS AMENDED BY THE PRESBYTERY, NOV. 20, 1892.)

CHARGE I.

THE Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D., a minister in said Church, and a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, with teaching (in two articles in the "New York Evangelist," dated respectively March 10, 1892, and April 7, 1892), "contrary to the regulations and practice of the Church founded" on the Holy Scriptures, and set forth in the Constitution of said Church, that a minister in said Church may abandon the essential features of the system of doctrine held by said Church, and which he received and adopted at his ordination, and rightfully retain his position as a minister in said Church.

SPECIFICATION I.

He teaches erroneously in the "New York Evangelist," March 10, 1892, that a doctrinal qualification is only required in the officers of the Church at the time of ordination.

SPECIFICATION II.

He teaches erroneously in the "New York Evangelist," March 10, 1892, and April 7, 1892, that whether in any individual case the Church requires continued adherence to the doctrinal standard received and adopted at ordination, is only to be made known by judicial process.

CHARGE II.

THE Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D., being a minister in said Church and a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, with teaching, in a pamphlet entitled "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," contrary to a fundamental doctrine of the Word of God and the Confession of Faith, that the Holy Spirit did not so control the inspired writers in their composition of the Holy Scriptures as to make their utterances absolutely truthful; *i. e.*, free from error when interpreted in their natural and intended sense.

SPECIFICATION I.

In a pamphlet entitled "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," published by the said Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D., in different editions in the year 1891, which pamphlet has been extensively circulated with his knowledge and approval, he teaches that the inspired author of Chronicles has asserted sundry errors of historic fact. — Pages 92, 100, 101 and 102.

SPECIFICATION II.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the inspired author of Chronicles has suppressed sundry historic truths, owing to inability or unwillingness to believe them. — Pages 104, 105, 107, 109.

SPECIFICATION III.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the in-

spired author of Chronicles incorporated into his narrative and indorsed by his authority material drawn from unreliable sources. — Pages 101, 103.

SPECIFICATION IV.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the historical unreliability of the inspired author of Chronicles was so great that the truth of history therein contained can only be discovered by such investigation, discrimination and sifting as is necessary to the discovery of the truth in histories by uninspired and fallible men. — Page 100.

SPECIFICATION V.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches the historic unreliability of the inspired author of Chronicles to have been such that "the truth of events" cannot be ascertained from what he actually asserts, but from what he unwittingly reveals. — Pages 100, 108, 109.

SPECIFICATION VI.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the historical unreliability of the inspired author of Chronicles extended to other inspired historic writers of the Old Testament. — Page 102.

SPECIFICATION VII.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the historic unreliability charged by him upon the inspired historical writers of the Old Testament is chargeable, though in a less degree, upon the inspired writers of the New Testament. — Page 115.

SPECIFICATION VIII.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the disclosures of religious experience given by the inspired authors of the Psalms are not in accord with the mind of the Holy Spirit, and free from moral defect. — Page 101.

SPECIFICATION IX.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the assertions made by the inspired authors of the Psalms are not to be relied upon as absolutely true. — Page 101.

SPECIFICATION X.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the last twenty-seven chapters of the Book of Isaiah are not correctly ascribed to him. — Pages 95, 96.

SPECIFICATION XI.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he specifically affirms the impossibility of the Old Testament Scriptures being free from all error of fact. — Page 92.

CHARGE III.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D., a minister in said Church, a member of the Presbytery of Cincinnati, in a pamphlet entitled "Biblical

Scholarship and Inspiration," while alleging that the Holy Scriptures are inspired, and an infallible rule of faith and practice, with denying in fact their inspiration in the sense in which inspiration is attributed to the Holy Scriptures, by the Holy Scriptures themselves and by the Confession of Faith.

SPECIFICATION I.

In a pamphlet entitled "Biblical Scholarship and Inspiration," published by the said Rev. Henry Preserved Smith, D. D., in different editions in the year 1891, which pamphlet has been extensively circulated with his knowledge and approval, he teaches that the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is consistent with the unprofitableness of portions of the sacred writings. — Page 116.

SPECIFICATION II.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is consistent with error of fact in their affirmations. — Pages 92, 93, 95, 96, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 115.

SPECIFICATION III.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is consistent with such unreliability in their utterances that the truth of events cannot be ascertained from their utterances themselves. — Pages 100, 102, 108, 109.

SPECIFICATION IV.

In the pamphlet referred to in Specification 1, he teaches that the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is consistent with a bias in the inspired writers, rendering them incapable of recording the truth of events because incapable of believing it. — Pages 104, 105, 107, 109.

THE AMERICAN POLICY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

THE policy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is taking shape, and is declaring itself with some definiteness, in respect to elementary education. The discussion of its policy, which is going on within that church and outside it, pertains chiefly to schools. Incidentally, the use of the English language in preaching is included, but the educational policy of the Roman Catholic Church is at present of most interest. This so directly pertains to American institutions and to the Americanizing of the Catholic population that it has a political, almost as much as it has an educational, importance. The differences of opinion within the church have created two parties, and have led to the appointment of an Apostolic Delegate for the United States, who is clothed with an authority superior to that of bishops and archbishops.

Any opinion which may be entertained on this subject must be held with a considerable degree of ignorance as to many of the facts in the case, and yet various indications give encouragement to the belief that the Catholic Church is wisely adapting itself to the spirit and methods

of republican government. It is true that the church has gained such a reputation for mystery, diplomacy, and dramatic effect as to create suspicion of indirection, even in explicit declarations and decisions. There is always some doubt whether or not its avowed is its real policy, whether apparent advance is anything more than politic concession. And yet the Catholic Church lives in the modern world, and may be credited with some sagacity. Certain objects which it has sincerely at heart determine the methods it will employ to gain those objects. The policy by which millions of adherents are to be governed cannot be entirely misunderstood by intelligent observers.

The elementary and religious education of Catholic children in America presents a difficult problem to the church. The preferable are not the practicable methods. The children come almost entirely from the families of working people, capable of little more than self-support, and many, indeed, not competent for that. Scarcely any amass property and wealth. The maintenance of a system of schools for the whole Catholic population by their own pecuniary contributions is impossible. It could not be expected, even if the people were not already taxed by the State for the support of public schools. The difficulty is increased by the presence, in every city, town, village, and district of these schools, which are open to all, free of charge, which are much better than schools maintained by the church, which are constantly improving, and which are highly valued by thousands of Catholic parents who have been educated in them. Moreover, the common-school system, supported by all, and open to all, has a sanctity, greater perhaps than it deserves, in the eyes of the American people, and cannot be opposed successfully even by so powerful an organization as the Roman Catholic Church. These are the stubborn facts which confront the ecclesiastical authorities, and which will not yield to any mysterious power supposed to reside in the church, nor to edicts of binding force which it may promulgate. It is therefore no easy task to provide the education which the church considers necessary. Catholics have to work out the problem very much as other human beings work out difficult problems, by some reasonable adaptation of means to ends, and other human beings can gain some reliable knowledge of the methods adopted.

In one respect all Catholics are agreed, namely, the necessity of the religious education of children. And by religious education they mean thorough instruction in the beliefs and practices of their own church. Compared with this, secular education is considered secondary. The proper method, as they all agree, is to combine the religious and the secular in daily schools taught by Catholic teachers. The two parties in the church differ as to the practicability, or even the possibility, of such instruction in America. One party believes that by direct maintenance of parochial schools, and by gaining political power so as to control some portion of the public revenue, the thing can be done. The other party

believes that the public schools must be used in large part for purposes of secular education, and that religious training must be otherwise provided. From present indications, the latter party is likely to prevail, accepting, perhaps unwillingly, the inevitable, but accepting it, and with as good a grace as possible. It may be that the party favorable to the public schools is itself divided into those who reluctantly consent to the use of the common schools, and those who sincerely believe that nothing can be better for the children than to receive part of their education in schools where they associate with children from all churches and all classes, and so, to use a current phrase, become Americanized.

There have been, during the last few years, several phases of Roman Catholic criticism, opinion, and experiment in respect to schools, and which now are producing a policy.

First came criticism of the public schools, on two apparently, but not really, contradictory assumptions. The religious teaching of the schools was objected to. The complaint was made that Catholic children were required to hear or read the Bible in the Protestant version, to listen to prayers not approved by Catholics, and to receive more or less erroneous teaching of history and literature permeated with Protestant beliefs. Twenty or thirty years ago this objection was pressed with vigor. It was declared to be a wrong to Catholics, a wrong to their conscience. Partly as a result of this criticism, the reading of the Bible and prayer, which had already become perfunctory in nearly all the schools, were discontinued in many of them, and care was taken to use reading-books and histories which could not be objectionable to Catholics. (In some places Protestants themselves have been disturbed by the use of text-books supposed to put an interpretation favorable to Catholicism on certain events of history.) At present there is not enough religious instruction in the public schools to do any appreciable good or harm. An occasional defense of religious instruction appears in periodicals, as in this "Review," in the preceding number, and, more recently still, in the "Christian Union;" but on examination it proves that what is desired is not specific instruction in doctrine, nor religious exercises according to the practices of some church, but religious example, a religious spirit, or, at the most, precepts concerning God as Ruler and Judge, and Jesus Christ as the perfect example, precepts to which none would be likely to object. The "Christian Union" starts with the correct assumption, fantastically and vaguely expressed, that every child is not a pretty kitten, to be developed into a sleek and comfortable tabby cat, but a child of God, with a nascent divinity, an immortal destiny, powers of faith, hope, and love, which, fed by God, render one capable of infinite patience, heroism, service, endurance, etc., etc., and forthwith makes the incorrect assumption that it is the function of the common school to educate him accordingly. But if any specific religious instruction is given, the Catholic object. In such a population as that of the United States, schools

supported by all, and open to all, must be limited in their instruction chiefly to the secular. The Catholic objected to the kind of religion which was in the schools, and with some reason. He has little reason to complain now, and would not have, if the religious education advocated in the articles referred to were given, for that is a religion without worship and without catechism or theology, merely the influence of teachers.

When the Catholics had succeeded in removing the vestiges of religious instruction from the schools, they next complained, and have continued to complain, of the absence of religion. The schools, they said, are godless, and we will not send our children to godless schools. There was no inconsistency. It had not been religion, but Protestant religion, to which they objected. In principle the articles in the "Christian Union" and in this "Review" agree with them. The secularization of the schools, one of these writers argues, is false in psychology, false in philosophy, and false in pedagogics. He thinks teachers should be chosen who possess religion, who are distinctly religious, — apparently advocating a religious qualification for common school teachers, to be determined by school committees. But we must not be diverted now by the mistaken views of some Protestants from the subject under consideration. The Catholics assumed that religion should be taught in the daily schools, that there is no other place and no other method suitable to thorough religious instruction, and so condemned the schools maintained by the State as failing in what should be their principal function.

The parochial schools established by the Catholic Church are the result. In the cities and larger parishes a considerable number of buildings were erected, as many children as could be accommodated were withdrawn from the public schools, Catholic teachers were employed, the beliefs of the Catholic Church were taught, and the forms of Catholic worship practiced. At the Baltimore Council a decree was issued directing the establishment of parochial schools in all parishes and indicating a general policy of education by means of such schools. Considerable activity was immediately shown in obeying the decree, and the parochial system was somewhat extended. It may have been, and probably was, expected that in an indirect way a portion of the taxes would be appropriated to Catholic schools. If Catholics should provide buildings and teachers for large numbers of children, they could demand exemption from the school tax, or could demand appropriation of funds equal to the amount of expenditure on the parochial schools. It may have been the intention to employ the great political power of Catholics in large cities to secure support in some way or other for these schools, and so strengthen the demand for it in all towns and villages. At all events, the attempt was to be made and the schoolhouses to be built as rapidly as possible. The undertaking, however, has thus far had only a limited success. For the reasons mentioned at the beginning of this article, the plan has proved impracticable, except in a few places. Neither has

there been any encouragement to the hope that public funds would be appropriated for Catholic schools. On the contrary some hostility to the parochial system has been awakened on account of its alleged tendency to separate children from Americanizing influences. The system has proved insufficient to provide for the education of all Catholic children. The schools which exist will be maintained, no doubt, and others will be built, just as other religious denominations sustain private schools, but these cannot be the main reliance.

The next step was in the direction of compromise. The Faribault and Stillwater experiment is fresh in recollection. Some of the parochial schools of those towns were transferred, at a nominal rent, to the Board of Education, and were brought under the public school system. The only difference was that Catholic teachers of the Dominican order were allowed to wear the robes of the order, and after school hours the buildings could be used for religious instruction. Opposition was aroused among Protestants and Catholics to such a degree that the experiment has been practically abandoned, but a long step was taken towards the recognition of the common-school system by Catholics.

And now a policy is declared for the church all over the country permitting parents to send their children to the public schools. The proposition of the Apostolic Delegate, which doubtless will become law, is as follows: "We strictly forbid any one, whether bishop or priest, and this is the expressed prohibition of the Sovereign Pontiff through the Sacred Congregation, either by act or threat, to exclude from the Sacraments as unworthy, parents who choose to send their children to the public schools. As regards the children, this enactment applies with still greater force." This is an important modification of the decree of the Baltimore Council, which prefaced the statement just quoted by these words, "When therefore for a sufficient reason, and one that has been approved by the bishop, parents choose to send their children to the public schools, provided the necessary precautions have been taken so that imminent danger may be prevented." These words are now omitted. There is in this action a recognition of the State as providing secular education. That is its definite and limited function. Religious education will be provided in other ways, through the services and instruction of the church, and in part in the parochial schools already existing. The logic of events has so plainly led to the adoption of this policy that it is not likely to be reversed. The arrangement is not the ideal of the Catholics. Attendance on the schools is by permission rather than by approbation. But the conclusion has been reached by such a process that the policy is to be considered permanent. It is not too much to hope that the declaration of this permission marks the end of opposition on the part of Catholics to the public schools. If no attempt is made to introduce religious instruction by specific methods, there will be no more trouble.

An important result is found in the use of English in all public schools.

At the West there are German, Polish, and French schools maintained by Catholics in which English is not spoken by teachers or scholars. As a consequence, the foreign population is kept separate, and is not Americanized. Free permission to attend the public schools will do away with this separation. It is, indeed, desired by an influential party in the Catholic Church that the teaching in private schools shall be in English, and that preaching everywhere shall be in English also.

It is obvious what the policy of the State, in respect to public schools, should be. The whole community should be taxed for their support, as in the past, without exception, and religious instruction should not be provided. Then, children will be prepared for useful citizenship. The State may wisely leave the home and the church to attend to religious instruction and training.

PHILLIPS BROOKS.

A FEW days ago Phillips Brooks was the central figure in New England life; the chief ornament of the American pulpit; the most eloquent preacher who spoke the English tongue; his renown — it is not extravagant to say it — was that of the foremost Christian orator in Christendom. But in the early morning of the 23d January, this gracious and gifted life, in all the vigor of its splendid qualities as preacher, ecclesiastical administrator, philanthropist, companion, and friend, was unexpectedly terminated. There was no lingering disease, no slow decay; after a brief and comparatively painless illness, "God's finger touched him, and he slept."

The news of his death sent a shock of grieved surprise throughout the city and the nation. Thousands of his fellow-citizens felt that they had sustained a personal loss. The unanimous outburst of mingled sorrow, reverence, and admiration from the churches of every sect, from the representatives of the most diverse opinions in politics and religion, from the public press, and from all sorts and conditions of men, has rendered affecting testimony to the deep and widespread influence which Phillips Brooks had exerted upon all classes of society. The universal sense of bereavement is itself the most eloquent eulogy of the goodness and greatness which it mourns.

It is needful and fitting that a man who stood so full in the public eye should be depicted by many minds. No single pen can hope to draw, at best, more than a partial portrait. It is most natural that great public meetings should have been held to commemorate his virtues and achievements. In impressive memorial services, notably those held in the Old South Meeting House, Boston, Carnegie Hall, New York, and the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, eloquent and able men have given emphatic expression to the love and reverence felt for the dead bishop. From pulpit and platform intimate friends have reverently unveiled the

endearing qualities of his nature and the hiding of his power, and others who did not possess the priceless boon of his intimate friendship have, from various points of view, generously and gratefully recognized their indebtedness to him as a source of light and inspiration. It is beautiful, it is the largest and richest education of a human nature, — this whole-hearted, disinterested admiration for some noble man !

A character and a career which have been the theme of so many glowing eulogies imply superior advantages of birth and breeding, and favorable conditions for the development of inherited gifts, and the unrestricted exercise of one's abilities. Phillips Brooks was most fortunate in the circumstances of his outward life. As a lineal descendant of Rev. John Cotton, the famous Puritan divine, on his father's side, and of the Phillips family, who reflected so much honor upon the public and social life of Eastern Massachusetts, on his mother's side, the best blood of historic New England flowed in his veins. From his father he inherited his magnificent physical proportions, sound judgment, and energetic will ; and from his mother, his moral and intellectual qualities. The early home-life, spent in the atmosphere of that comfort, refinement, and piety which marked the finest social life of Boston at a time when it rightfully was called the "Athens of America," furnished a background of wise, Christian nurture, bright associations, and happy memories. The Boston Latin School, under the inspiring headship of the famous "Master Gardner," gave him the most thorough secondary education of the day, and the stimulating companionship of the choicest youth of the city. Entering Harvard College at sixteen, he took the full course of instruction with an eager and appreciative fidelity, and distinctly felt the impress upon his intellectual character of that lucid and sagacious Christian thinker, — President James Walker. Young Brooks grew up under the shadow of the church, and was early destined to the Episcopal ministry. The Divinity School at Alexandria, Virginia, was specially adapted to nourish the religious experience and train the theological life of the youthful candidate for orders. City born and bred, and with a natural affinity for the zest and movement of city life, it is not strange that, upon graduation from the Seminary, he should have accepted the charge of a city parish. In 1857, at the age of twenty-four, he became rector of the Church of the Advent in Philadelphia. Three years later his ministry was transferred to the wealthier and more important parish of the Church of the Holy Trinity in the same city. After a service of seven years he came to Boston, in 1869, and, in his thirty-fifth year, assumed the rectorship of Trinity Church. For twenty-two years he ministered to this parish until, in October, 1891, he was consecrated Bishop of the Diocese of Massachusetts. This brief survey of his training and active service discloses a certain naturalness in the order and development of his singularly harmonious career. At every stage of his life and in every field of activity he found that fitting support, restful security, and helpful encouragement, which his genius and purpose naturally required.

While we may not attach too much importance to the external forces that nourished his native gifts, still they cannot be separated from the sources of his wonderful influence and phenomenal success. Phillips Brooks had the inestimable advantage of being well-born. He started in the race with a nature enriched by an inheritance of the results of generations of moral struggles and triumphs. In the case of a man like him, ancestry, education, and favoring conditions, cannot account for everything. There is always some mysterious element, impalpable, but real and powerful, some subtle blending and relation of qualities, that puts the unmistakable stamp of individuality upon his nature. He surpasses his fellows through a peculiar originality that forms the rich soil in which every varied manifestation of faculty takes root, and receives its own direction and color.

Phillips Brooks's nature was a healthy, vigorous, buoyant, hopeful nature. There was a youthfulness of spirit which never deserted him. It was a sunlike nature, bright and bountiful, which constantly radiated the light and warmth of cheerful and beneficent influences. His very presence gave a new value to every occasion that he gladdened with his beaming face. The friends of his early years delight to dwell upon the promising graces of mind and of person, and those natural gifts of speech and persuasion, that so distinguished him in maturer years. Neither in his young manhood nor throughout his public career did he subject himself to the slightest charge of vanity. His simplicity and sincerity of character were absolute. It would be difficult to name a genius which has been so praised and so caressed by the multitude, that has remained so perfectly exempt from self-consciousness, self-love, and all forms of affectation. But his geniality of nature was as manly and resolute as it was wholesome and sweet. In him was none of the weakness and complacency that so often accompany mere good-nature. He could put his finger firmly upon the morally lame, and halt, and blind, and say, "Thou ailest here and here." Evil, littleness, and meanness could not live in his rebuking presence. Neither was there the slightest intimation that he regarded himself as a superior being; there was no condescension to the weak and the poor, there was no servility to the rich; every man was met in the fraternal spirit of one who thoroughly believed that all men are brethren. He had the power of attaching others to him. Children were instinctively attracted towards him; and the perplexed, the unfortunate, the disappointed, and heart-broken, instinctively sought his consoling counsel, and, busiest of men though he was, they never sought in vain. Somehow he always found time to give *himself*.

We have dwelt upon his benevolent, sympathetic, and manly nature, because it seems to have been the fountain-head of his influence and his power. His capacious intellect was enriched and energized by his emotional forces. His sympathy gave him swift and penetrating insight, not only into the secret places of human nature, but into the essential ele-

ments of questions that agitate the mental and moral life of humanity. The leading tendency of his mind was to view every subject presented to him in its principles. His mental movement was clear, unceasingly alert, elastic, rapid, and sure-footed. If pleasure is "the reflex of unimpeded energy," this man must have felt the deep joy of constant mental activity. United to this natural aptitude for noble thought and profound sentiment was a certain fineness of mental quality which sprang from the ideal powers of his mind. His innate sense of the beautiful in nature, art, and character, was a pervading and moulding influence in every form of intellectual and moral effort. In smaller natures than his a keen sense of beauty is a source of irritation. Their fanaticism of the perfect makes them impatient with the weaknesses and deformities of men. But Phillips Brooks, serious as he was in purpose, sympathetic as he was in feeling, had the saving element of humor in his large humanity; and yet he was no humorist. The insight of humor enabled him to discriminate between the follies and foibles of men, and the knavery, crime, and moral deformity in real wickedness. He knew how to make allowance for "human nature." Idealist as he was, he was blessed with a large, round-about common sense, and had acquired a wide acquaintance with the world. His charity and toleration were as wide as his knowledge of human nature. He distinguished opinions from the persons who held them, and could respect an individuality the very opposite of his own. In his experience of life he encountered the meanness and malice of inferior natures, but there was never the expression of retaliation, nor any selfish demand for personal justice. One cannot imagine envy or jealousy, anger or resentment, as resting in his magnanimous soul.

But sense and sensibility, conscience and character, were all pervaded with an atmosphere of genuine spirituality. In his thinking and enterprise he viewed everything in relation to their centre and their source. He never wearied of bringing into the life of thought and the life of action the idea of God. Closer yet, it was the idea of God in Christ that in his view purifies and saves the individual life and the life of society. The sentiment of what Coleridge has called "other-worldliness" pressed upon his mind, and made him "a soldier of the chivalry of spirit." It was the heroism of the spirit that impelled him fearlessly to rebuke the purely mercenary motive in business, self-seeking in politics, bigotry in religion, and low views in social life. He drew his inspiration from spiritual sources. Christ in him, in the true Pauline sense, was, preëminently, the formative principle of his entire life. Great as he was by natural endowment, one feels that he could not have been so great without the full, free play of the spiritual forces in him. That was a deeply-perceived truth concerning him which was uttered by his personal friend, Rev. George A. Gordon, "You cannot make such men as Phillips Brooks without God. You cannot construct such characters without the forces of Christianity."

The qualities of this opulent character found their richest and truest expression in his divine calling as a Preacher of Righteousness. His expressional gifts of language and of public address matched his peerless qualities of intellect and character. It was the most natural thing in the world that he should have been a preacher of the gospel. It was an inevitable result in the logic of character. One might almost say that he could not have prevented his being a preacher if he had tried to do so; as a matter of fact many of the friends of his youth did try to dissuade him from the ministry. His fitness for preaching was the Divine call; and he loved his calling with a passionate devotion. His shining gift was a rare power of self-communication. In everything he said or did he imparted his personality. So far as one may dare to hazard an opinion on such an inscrutable thing as the secret of a great preacher's power it would seem to lie in this marvelous faculty of communicating himself; and we have seen what a precious thing *that* was. With his massiveness of personality, and his power of expressing it, it is easy to see how he took such a strong hold upon the masses, and upon the strong men and women in the masses, and lifted them up to the height and reach of his own lofty ideals of life and action.

Original as he was in his thinking, he had no novelties to offer in the subject-matter of his preaching. It was the same old gospel that he had known from childhood. Competent witnesses who sat under his preaching testify that they never missed the recognition of the accepted doctrines of his church. The nearest approach he ever made to systematic theological exposition was in his lectures on "The Influence of Jesus." The fundamental principles of his thought and teaching are clearly set forth in this book. Evidently, the doctrine of the Incarnation was to him the central doctrine of Christianity. The one great, inspiring idea which lies in and behind Christianity is "the fatherhood of God, and the childship of every man to Him." Jesus, he said, was fully conscious of his Sonship, and it was and is His special mission to make all men conscious of their sonship. Dr. Brooks's printed sermons, taken as a fair representation of the matter and manner of his preaching, reveal a hearty belief in the substance of Christian theology. In the selection of special themes for the pulpit he was always fresh and often surprising. A study of his discourses shows that the vital element which gives unity to his religious teaching is its Christian morality. Phillips Brooks was a moralist, but distinctively and pervadingly a *Christian* moralist. He was not fond of so-called doctrinal preaching; he loved to preach about life, and the application of Christian ideas to the every-day life of the men and women before him in this present, work-a-day world.

Logic, theology, philosophy, science, literature, — he knew and used them all, as Shakespeare used them, — in forms of practical, living truth, clothed in the flesh and blood of feeling and imagination, and addressed not to the intellect as such, but to the whole man, to the

conscience and to the heart. He keenly observed and analyzed the human heart; he was a pathologist and specialist of the soul. He knew and could depict the unhappiness and discontent of men, their frailty and their sin; but he showed to men that man's wretchedness is "the wretchedness of a prince." For their cure he led them, not simply to Christianity, nor to the truths of the Christian religion, but to the personal Christ himself. He strove to unite the life of every man to the life of Christ. Christ, he affirmed, is the only true interpretation and solution of the problem of life. The truths of Christ were great Christian facts that must be wrought into men's mental and spiritual life. From this point of view he proclaimed the identification of Christian dogma and Christian morality. Christianity, he contended, is not the collection of an organized system of doctrines, but the vital principle of a new life. "Religion is morality sown in the soil of grace." Able men were saying all around him that the historical and philosophical foundations of the Christian creed were only shifting sands. No matter: this observer of the things of the human soul knew that the inmost life of man has the same needs, the same aspirations to-day, that it had when Christ told men to come unto Him and He would give them rest. No wonder that serious spirits and thoughtful minds found in such a teacher a master of the moral life, a true pastor of souls.

He freely used, and with equal power, both the written and extemporaneous methods of public discourse. With what lucidity and force, with what wealth of thought, what power of amplification, what unctiousness, what graphic power, what variety of color, what felicity, oftentimes with what splendor of illustration, did he illumine and impress his message! His literary expression was simply a natural self-expression. His style was the vehicle of his rich and varied mental and moral character. Long practice in public speaking had given him literary skill in the command of his naturally copious resources of language. His style was interesting because it was the medium of bringing his hearers into close contact with his own interesting personality. As he was a perfect gentleman in nature and breeding, his speech could not well help being expressed in a finished manner. When we heard him we felt that we were listening, not to a more learned or a more profound man than many in his audience, but to a man who had lived more deeply than we, whose words and illustrations sprang straight from experience and not from books. He used familiar words, but somehow they were stamped with a special value as they came from his lips. He gave us no artificial flowers; his illustrations seemed to spring up under the march of his discourse in the simplest, most natural way, without his seeking for them. They were drawn from earth and air, and sky and sea, from poets, — notably Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, — from art and science, but chiefly from the experiences of common life. But his great gift of speech never was used with a purely æsthetic purpose; it was

always subservient to the practical aim of effectively conveying his view of the truth he was enforcing. So refined was his sensibility, so true his good sense, so earnest his purpose, that he uttered no trivial expressions, suggested no offensive images, made no slips of taste. His humor sometimes manifested itself in a shrewd delineation of some weakness of character, but he rarely caused a smile upon the face of his auditors; neither was his pathos, though often moving in its sympathetic expression, of that peculiar quality that touches the fountain of tears. He was too manly to indulge in the pathetic fallacy, or wantonly to play with the feelings of his auditors. In the structure of his sermons he was an unrivaled master in that kind of simplicity of order and of amplification which makes a series of thoughts spring each from its predecessor, and the whole discourse to move along with a rhythm of its own, as if it were a harmonious group of ideas in motion towards a natural end. While some of his pulpit work bears the inequalities and discords which naturally accompany the preaching of an extraordinarily busy man, most of his sermons are perfect models of the best modern type of preaching. It would be difficult for the keenest homiletic critic to find any serious flaw, in structure, tone, or style, in discourses like these:— Standing before God; Backgrounds and Foregrounds; Disciples and Apostles; Going up to Jerusalem; The Mind's Love for God; Why could not we cast him out? The Candle of the Lord; Man's Wonder and God's Knowledge; The Pattern in the Mount.

In passing naturally from his literary style to his delivery we find no break in the wholeness of his speech. It was a wonderful delivery. Like his style it was, in the main, an adequate vehicle for the amplitude, weight, and movement of the communication. Nature formed him to attract and command the multitude through public address. He was not a man of middling stature either of mind or body. In figure he was at once titanic and noble. The warmth and light of his sunny nature were radiated in his face. His features were massive, but regular and harmonious. The eyes were dark and penetrating, but mild in expression. His hair was originally of a dark, silken brown, which time had turned to gray. He had the mouth of an orator, which opened wide between mobile and delicate lips, with a serious expression, yet ready to break into a smile. His bearing was erect, and carried with an easy dignity which indicated perfect self-possession. His walk was an elastic movement, with long, manly strides, and his head, both in walking and in public speaking, was thrown a little back, and with occasional upward glances of the eye. His voice had not great volume, nor was it resonant or pure. In *timbre* it was a pleasant baritone; in the production of the voice, there was a noticeable "throatiness," yet there was no harshness. He often took in breath with an audible gasp, and failed properly to economize the breath. But notwithstanding its defective quality and unskillful technical management, it was a voice which was the appropriate organ of a sincere, an

earnest, indeed of a passionate soul. It perfectly conveyed the warmth, the geniality, and the spiritual feeling of the speaker. His intense and self-forgetful earnestness was expressed with perfect freedom and energy. But it was an energy which is not exactly the explosiveness of mere loudness, suggesting muscular exertion; it was rather a force penetrated with sweetness and a noble tenderness, the mingling of delicacy and power, of softness and of fire, suggesting the presence of a magnetic nerve-force. Such an energy takes on the new name of enthusiasm. Oftentimes, in moments of elevated emotion, with head and eyes uplifted, his face shining with inward fire, his enthusiasm seemed nothing less than the expression of exalted peace. In the matter of expressive action, his gestures were quiet, spontaneous, natural, and comparatively rare, but not especially significant; they usually symbolized discrimination in the use of his index finger; sometimes the action expressed an emphatic mood of feeling, at times with the open palm, at other times with both hands extended to the audience; occasionally one hand would be raised with outward palm, and in harmonious action with the uplifted head. In repose he frequently stood with hands clasped in front; often with arm akimbo, and the palm, with spread fingers, upon his breast. But the prominent trait of his delivery was the marvelous speed of his enunciation. His speaking was the wonder and despair of the reporters. The swiftest of the English stenographers says that he never listened to such a continuous, uninterrupted flow of rapid articulation. His usual rate of utterance, by actual timing of the watch, was from 190 to 215 words per minute; while the average rate is about 120 words per minute. His rapidity was doubtless the resultant of his tremendous nervous energy, the exuberance of his thought, and velocity of mental movement. The effect was often detrimental to distinctness; he recalled words and re-shaped his sentences; the rhythm was often marred in its "melody." His rate of utterance was so rapid that it was difficult for the average auditor to follow the thought or to appreciate the force and beauty of his illustrations. It was almost impossible to reproduce the discourse as one would try to tell it to another. John Bright used to say that one of the most difficult things he had to do as a speaker was to speak with sufficient deliberation for the reception of his thought on the part of the auditors. It would have been both impossible and undesirable for Phillips Brooks to have regulated his speed so as to be deliberate without seeming to be slow. But in later years he availed himself of his "landing-places," and greatly aided his hearers in getting the order and structure of discourse, by closing a division of the sermon with a natural cadence, followed by an appreciable pause, and a dropping of the eyes; then raising his head he would state the next leading thought, and after a deliberate sentence or two plunge headlong with impetuous speed into the development of the new idea. But notwithstanding these defects of vocal management the voice was an eloquent voice. The listener was

transported in spite of himself, and compelled to listen with rapt attention to the closing word. Even when the language rolled along with unslackening current and imperious flood, the speaker's utterance carried with it such treasures of thought and felicity of expression that you wished he would talk on forever. He was not a model of speaking, — although scores of imitators evidently think that he was, — but his preaching will remain in the memory of thousands as the highest type of chaste and noble sacred eloquence.

Had the genius of Phillips Brooks been directed solely to authorship, it is easy to believe that, with his gifts of intellect and power of expression, he would have achieved eminent and enduring distinction. His artistic and poetic temperament suggest the possibility of splendid works of fiction and of poetry. That he had the innate power of a poet, and did not altogether lack "the accomplishment of verse," is evident from the pieces of religious poetry which he permitted to be printed. But he made no venture into the province of letters as a profession. All that he published may properly be regarded as homiletic literature. In 1877 he published his "Lectures on Preaching" delivered to the Divinity students of Yale University. In these incomparable lectures he unfolds his theory of preaching, and indicates the homiletical principles which lie at the basis of effective pulpit discourse. He speaks largely of his own life in the ministry, and so far as the sources and the mechanics of preaching are concerned, he freely discloses the secret of his own power. The "Bohlen Lectures" on "The Influence of Jesus" were given in Philadelphia in 1879. The general topic is the Power of Christianity over Man, — its Source, its Character, its Issue. The ruling idea which gives doctrinal unity to the series is the Personal Force of Jesus. The treatment of this inspiring idea is characteristically suggestive and fascinating. His published sermons have appeared in five volumes: "Sermons" (1879); "The Candle of the Lord" (1881); "Sermons preached in English Churches" (1883); "Twenty Sermons" (1886); and "The Light of the World" (1890). He has also published two lectures on "Toleration," and a few single sermons on special occasions. All these lectures, sermons, and addresses had been spoken previous to their publication, and possess the oral qualities of the style of public address; hence they cannot be regarded as entitled to strictly literary distinction. Phillips Brooks is a modern and not a classic. His work bears the stamp of the times in which he lives. It is addressed to present humanity. The extemporaneous instinct in him is too strong to give him an established literary position as such; but his sermons as a noble contribution to homiletic literature will be read and studied for generations.

When Dr. Brooks left the pulpit of Trinity Church to enter the higher sphere of the bishopric, his preaching increased in frequency and in power. Thousands of people heard him as a bishop who never could have heard him as the rector of Trinity. His official visitations have

been described as "ovations." Everywhere he was equally effective. He gave of his best. He took as great pains and achieved as great success with the simple congregation in a country parish, or with a group of fishermen, as he did with the most distinguished metropolitan audience. In his adaptation of theme and of style to the less educated he always respected their native intelligence, and never allowed them to feel that he was "talking down" to the level of their capacity. Phillips Brooks, as a bishop of the church, put his whole soul into his work. In very truth he was the spiritual chief of his diocese, and exerted himself to the utmost to awaken religious life in every corner of it. In his brief episcopate of a little more than a year he illustrated a new type of the ecclesiastic. His clergy quickly discovered that he was not the bishop of a party, but the servant of them all; he was not only acting as their official overseer, but as a motive-power; he inspired, as well as supported and encouraged them. As a natural consequence, he obtained a deep hold upon his clergy, and an enthusiastic response to his efforts for identifying church-life with the best social life of the community. His breadth of view, his good sense, and his warm friendliness of disposition, quickly banished any prejudice which had been expressed against his election, and united the different ecclesiastical elements in the diocese to an unprecedented degree. As a hard-working bishop he manifested a remarkable genius for administration in the precision and fullness with which he performed the detail work of the diocese. In every respect he triumphantly justified the enthusiasm of his friends in advocating his claims to the high office of bishop.

In the great church outside his own communion Bishop Brooks held a position of the highest distinction. He never was anything less nor other than a loyal Episcopalian; but his Christian spirit was so catholic that he gave out to every sect, whenever he had opportunity, what was in him of the life of God. No man ever did more than he to obliterate denominational differences; and Christian workers in all sects affectionately spoke of him as "our bishop."

In his relations to society Bishop Brooks represented religion and the church with signal dignity and affability. Although a man of sincerest spirituality of character he was no ascetic. His genial humor and his charm of manner and of conversation made him a great favorite in social life. He was as irresistible in the drawing-room as in the pulpit or on the platform. He was much sought for as an after-dinner speaker, but restricted his attendance upon festal scenes to the narrowest possible limit. Whenever he spoke at the banquet-table he entered heartily into the spirit of the occasion, and never failed to speak the apt and effective word, but before he sat down he had succeeded in indicating the higher significance of his theme and of the hour. As an ecclesiastic in society he embodied Edmund Burke's ideal of a prelate who "could make religion hold its head high in courts and public assemblies."

In the rare combination of the qualities of a great preacher, an efficient bishop, a steadfast friend, a charming companion, a manly man amongst men, a type of true Christian manliness, — when shall we see his like again? It is difficult to associate his name with death. Already measures have been taken in different directions to keep his memory alive. Trinity Church has honored itself and him by promptly acting upon his last request to complete the edifice in accordance with its great architect's design, beginning the fund with his own generous bequest. Copley Square will doubtless be adorned with a memorial statue erected by his native city, which he honored by his lofty type of citizenship. Harvard University, which he loved and labored for through a devotion to her highest interests second only to his attachment for Trinity, is likely to have the "Phillips Brooks House" built for the concentration and increased efficiency of the religious life of the University. Though much is being done to commemorate his life and work, there is work still to be done. We may hope that it will be a work which will exhaust all that with propriety may be positively and precisely known of him. It should be a work that will be a solid and final basis for the study and admiration of this great preacher and still greater man, and become a source of perennial inspiration to the ministry of the land. Through his sermons and lectures his spirit will become incarnated in young, vigorous, progressive Christian preachers; but they can come into contact with his personality only through an adequate biography that shall not fall short of the nobleness of the subject or of the veneration which is due to it, but shall reveal him to men as God formed him "to address his fellows, and to look into the heavens."

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

- PRACTICAL ETHICS. By WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE, D. D., President of Bowdoin College. Pp. xi, 208. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1892.
- DUTY. A Book for Schools. By JULIUS H. SEELYE, D. D., LL. D., late President of Amherst College. Pp. 71. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1891.
- ETHICS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE. By C. C. EVERETT, Bussey Professor of Theology in Harvard University. Pp. iv, 185. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1892.

These three books by prominent educators are designed as text-books for young people. The first, by President Hyde, may perhaps find a place by the side of theoretical treatises in colleges, as well as in the common schools; the other two are prepared for children and for pupils in grammar or high schools, but not for students in college. It is a question how much direct instruction of young people in ethics should be attempted, and how far any text-book can be available for the purpose. There is the danger that the divisions and subdivisions of a book will make the impression of a complicated science, and that the scheme will seem like a table of classified rules, while the principles of morality are

not discerned. The simplest book presents many details to be remembered, and sense of proportion is quite likely to be lost when the lesser and the greater virtues cover an equal number of pages to be studied. Such books as those now referred to might be used as reading-books, and the reading accompanied with comments and explanations by teachers, but a system of ethics with many classifications should not be laid upon the memory of the young.

It is interesting to note the different methods employed by the three authors. President Hyde begins with the body, in respect to food and drink, dress, and exercise, considers duties to self and to others, and ends with duty to God. President Seelye begins with duty to God, which he makes the foundation and explanation of morality, and proceeds with duties to the family, to self, and to government. Professor Everett is more philosophical in showing the development of morality by collision of customs; types of virtue, as the Stoic and Epicurean; and self-realization in specific virtues; but makes no allusion to God, except to remark at the close that a complete study of ethics leads to a consideration of the relations of morality and religion. Of the three books Dr. Hyde's adheres most closely to one principle of arrangement. It is the method of Aristotle, which finds virtue in the *mean* between excess and defect. In respect to every object seven points are made: the duty, the virtue, the reward, the temptation, the vice of defect, the vice of excess, and the penalty. To every one a designation is given; for example, in the case of food and drink, the duty is vigor, the virtue is temperance, the reward is health, the temptation is appetite, the vice of defect is asceticism, the vice of excess is intemperance, the penalty is disease. The method stimulates interest as the ingenuity of the author appears in the application of his method. These characteristics are so important that they can be recognized in all cases. The tone of the book is healthy. Good sense marks every page. It appeals strongly to self-respect.

Dr. Seelye's book is a succession of strong and positive affirmations. It leaves much to the intuitional sense of morality and to the traditional sanctions of conduct. Its strength is in the uncompromising demand of right, which comes to expression at every point. The representation of morality as duty, that which is due, due first of all to God, that which is claimed, is rather oppressive. It almost necessarily suggests disinclination rather than spontaneity and gladness. One does what is right because he ought to do it, whether he likes to or not. All this is true, but it makes the moral imperative equivalent to the whole of virtue. The ideal or the good should first be discerned, and duty or right determined thereby. Some sections of the book are discriminating and excellent, as the section on freedom. The classification is somewhat faulty in the subdivisions of duties to mankind, where duties in the family precede duties to self, there being no apparent reason why the family should not be considered under duties to others, which follow duties to self. The book is too didactic and too free from illustrations to interest the young.

The charm which characterizes everything from Professor Everett's pen is not wanting in this book on ethics. The style is simple and pellucid. The illustrations illustrate. The virtues appear attractive. To the reader it seems surprising that any one should be disinclined to practice any of the virtues which are described. The evolution of morality is sketched along lines which a thoughtful child can understand and be interested in. The manly virtues of fortitude, courage, and heroism come first. Self-respect, self-control, and self-reliance are made prominent. The finer moralities of good temper and courtesy are as finely set forth. The training and use of the imagination is seen to be an important duty. Temptations are insidious and attractive, and so the more dangerous. Conscience may be warped or deadened. Evidently such descriptions and delineations are not to be memorized, but may be useful if they are carefully and frequently read.

It is a question whether the term "ethics" should not be confined more rigidly to the science or philosophy of morality. It is used with so wide an extension that it is made to include everything which pertains to morality. "Applied" ethics and "practical" ethics are designations which amount almost to a contradiction in terms. It may not be possible, however, to recover ethics to its distinction as a science from morality as actual conduct.

George Harris.

THE SCRIPTURES, HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN, arranged and edited as an Introduction to the Study of the Bible. By EDWARD T. BARTLETT, D. D., and JOHN P. PETERS, PH. D. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1893.

There will be no disposition in any quarter to deny the fact that of all books known to the English-reading public none approaches the Bible in the extent to which it is misunderstood and abused. By as much as it exceeds in circulation and in importance any other book, by so much does it exceed all in the degree to which its utterances are made to mean anything or nothing, according as fantastic imagination or mechanical indifference predominates in the mind of the reader.

It may not be universally conceded that the remedy for this anomaly is in the plea of Matthew Arnold, that the Bible be read as literature and not as dogma; but it must be granted by all classes of Christian thinkers that the Bible must be its own interpreter, and that to reach any end of the monstrosities of allegorical, typological, and other fantastic methods of interpretation, the rules of exegesis must be determined by the objective facts of grammar and history, and not by the subjective disposition of the individual reader. The Bible, in short, means *something* and not *anything*; and this is the fundamental element in the religious upheaval of the day.

To the right solution of this question the book before us is an important contribution. In the words of Dr. Howard Crosby, "It is the Bible

story in Bible words, with just such omissions and insertions as to make consecutive and understood the entire narrative. It is the work of devout and scholarly men, and will prove a help to Bible study."

Had the Bible ever been "edited and arranged" in the popular editions, as is done in the present three small volumes; not by the alteration of anything, save by occasional simplification of language, or correction of mistranslation; not by omission of any portion in the interest of any theory whatsoever; not by the insertion of anything, save here and there a dozen words of bracketed editorial explanations at the beginning of the separate books, etc.; but simply by a rational grouping of the writings in something like chronological order, and with some plan made intelligible to the reader, it would never have been possible for the enormities of popular misexplanation, misuse, and misunderstanding to have gained the foothold they have. The simple device of italicising quoted language throws a flood of light over whole chapters and books which before were darkness itself to the average reader. To take a brief example, what a different light does it shed upon even the terror of those most awful words of Christ in which He speaks of the Gehenna of fire "where their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched," to see at a glance that Jesus is not formulating here a doctrine of his own independently, but is simply referring to one of the features of the Messianic time of judgment as fixed in the last verse of Isaiah! The separation of the codes of civil and ritual law from the narrative of the Pentateuch is one of the most necessary and helpful of the instances of editorial grouping, and will have the inestimably beneficial result that for that great number of young Christians who take up the Bible with the laudable purpose of reading it straight through, but almost invariably stop hopelessly stranded in the interminable desert wastes of the Levitical law, there will now appear a greater number who have made the discovery that not only the Bible can be read through, but is full of thrilling interest, when read in some rational way. What labyrinths of tortuous, and, alas, disingenuous "harmonizations" are saved to the reader of the Gospels, by the simple device of relegating the metaphysical and theological Fourth Gospel to a position by itself, at the end of the list of New Testament books, where both chronologically and generically it belongs, instead of placing it, almost without a break, immediately between the two halves of Luke's double work! The mere fact that the Biblical books are actual *books*, capable of being arranged in a different order, will be a revelation to the majority of readers.

We cannot but entertain the reasonable, religious, and lively hope that "The Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian," will find its way not only to the shelves of our Sunday-school libraries, where it certainly should go first of all, but to the children's book-shelves, and to the family altar. Simple as is its aim, it is assured already of a place in the library of the scholar.

B. W. Bacon.

OSWEGO, N. Y.

THEOLOGICAL PROPÆDEUTIC. A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, Exegetical, Historical, Systematic, and Practical; including Encyclopædia, Methodology, and Bibliography. Part I. A Manual for Students. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Pp. 233. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

At last we have a text-book of Theological Encyclopædia that we can call our own. German and Swiss theological students since 1833 have had their Hagenbach's "*Encyclopädie*," which has passed through a dozen or more editions, while the same subject is treated on a much larger scale in the elaborate handbook, or rather series of handbooks, recently edited under the supervision of Zückler. Other works of similar aim and scope have appeared from time to time in Germany, Holland, and France. In England, James Drummond (1884), and especially Principal Cave (1886), have published valuable Introductions to the study of Theology. On this side of the water very little has been done in this direction. Some years ago the attempt was made (by Crooks and Hurst; New York, 1884) to adapt Hagenbach to the needs of English and American students, by translating it and making various additions, especially in the lists of books of reference. A few treatises covering some part of the ground, by American authors, have been published. But the subject of General Introduction to Theological Science has as yet hardly found a place of its own, in many of our theological seminaries. It is sometimes disposed of in a lecture or two, at the beginning of the course; sometimes omitted altogether. But the need is beginning to be felt, and the present volume, with its fellow, soon to be published, will go far toward meeting this need, if I am not mistaken.

The aim of the book is concisely stated in the Preface as follows: "It is intended to be a guide for theological students in the first year of their course of preparation for the ministry of the gospel. It gives an outline of the various departments of theology, defines their nature and aim, their boundary lines and organic connection, their respective functions and value; it sketches their history, and indicates the best methods of prosecuting their study. It answers the purposes of a map for orientation."

Dr. Schaff is perhaps, of all theological teachers in America, the one best fitted to write such a book as this. Aside from the fact that he has lectured on this particular subject for many years, his long experience as a teacher and an associate of teachers and scholars in this country and abroad, and his exceptionally wide acquaintance with theological literature, will give his words peculiar weight.

The title "*Propædeutic*" is an innovation, though it has been occasionally employed (for the department of Methodology) in German text-books. The usual term "*Encyclopædia*" is justly objected to by the author, as also by his English predecessors, on the ground that it is sure

to be misunderstood. To Englishmen or Americans, the word suggests an alphabetical arrangement of facts, in some or all departments of knowledge. The bewilderment of Dr. Schaff's friend, mentioned in the Preface, on hearing that he was "Professor of Encyclopædia," reminds one of the blunder of the honest farmer who refused to subscribe for an encyclopædia, because he "knew he should never learn to ride on the thing." As for the form of the word chosen, it is in accordance with a uniform terminology which the author has adopted for convenience, — thus, Dogmatic, Ethic, Homiletic (like Logic, Rhetoric, etc.), instead of the plural forms to which we have been accustomed.

His method of dividing and arranging the subject-matter is practically the same as that adopted by nearly all his predecessors. He makes the following divisions: I. Religion and Theology in general. II. Exegetical Theology. III. Historical Theology. IV. Systematic Theology. V. Practical Theology. Of these parts, or books, the first two (constituting about one half of the whole) are contained in the present volume.

Book I. is occupied chiefly with the classification and description of the various religions of the world. Convenient statistical tables are added. The several theories of Subjective Religion are then discussed. Finally, Theology is defined, in its various relations.

Book II. includes 1. Biblical Philology. The languages belonging to Bible study. 2. Biblical Archæology. The Geography and Natural History of the Bible, as well as Archæology proper. 3. Biblical Isagogic (Introduction). Including Textual and Historical Criticism, Canon, etc. 4. Biblical Hermeneutic and Exegesis. Including a succinct history of Exegesis.

One is struck, at the first glance into any part of the book, with the admirable conciseness of statement. Each part of the material seems to have been packed into the smallest possible compass, and the divisions and subdivisions are so clearly and conveniently arranged, that one is almost surprised at the ease with which one finds his way about. The purpose of the author to make a sort of outline map for purposes of orientation has been excellently carried out. A comparison of the handbooks of Cave and Hagenbach makes this all the more evident.

Instead of giving lists of books at the end of each section, the author has decided to put the department of Bibliography in a place by itself, at the end of the work. This arrangement will certainly be more convenient, for purposes of reference, than the usual one; and the text will be left free, where, by the old method, its short paragraphs were too often fairly buried from sight.

The department of Methodology, or How to Study, makes its appearance, from time to time, in the form of practical advice to the student. There are short paragraphs entitled: Hints for the Study of Theology; The Student's Library; General Hints for the Study of the Bible; Hints for Exegetical Study; besides many words of counsel given less directly,

in an occasional way. To say that these "hints" are uniformly excellent, would be to state an axiom for all those who know Dr. Schaff.

In short, the book is thoroughly practical, in form as well as in purpose, and it is to be hoped that it will soon find its permanent place as a true "student's companion" in our theological schools. Aside from the large amount of useful information here brought within easiest reach, the value to the student of such a general view of systematized theological knowledge must be apparent. The second volume, with the Bibliography, will be eagerly welcomed.

"Jabal," page 37, should be "Jubal." "Gregory of Nazianzen," page 78, appears to be a slip of the pen. The connection between pages 113 and 114 has been somewhat disturbed in the printing. The typographical work is otherwise excellent.

Charles C. Torrey.

SEPTUAGINTA STUDIEN VON PAUL DE LAGARDE. Aus dem siebenunddreissigsten und achtunddreissigsten Bande der Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. 4to, pp. 92, 102. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung. 1892.

The first of these Studies is devoted to the Greek Judges. As long ago as 1705, Grabe, in his letter to Mill, showed that in this book the Alexandrine manuscript exhibits a type of text entirely distinct from that of the Roman edition. In 1889-90, while working upon a hitherto inedited recension of the Greek Judges, I came to the conclusion that the families of MSS. of which A and B are the conventional exponents represent different translations. In a paper read before the Society of Biblical Literature, May 28, 1890, I presented the evidence of this fact, and defined it as the next task of criticism sharply to separate these two translations instead of jumbling them together in one apparatus as has always been done. In reply to a letter communicating these results, Professor Lagarde, in a letter dated July 18, 1890, informed me that he already had in type a considerable part of an edition of the Greek Judges. This edition now lies before us. It is, alas, only a fragment containing the first five chapters; but even so it is a conclusive demonstration of the fact that we have two independent translations of the book.

Lagarde has printed the two versions face to face on opposite pages, with a select apparatus. To the witnesses for the version represented by B he has added an important manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 20 002; containing the last verses of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth), which Lagarde thinks once formed part of the same codex with the Bodleian Genesis (E, of his "Genesis Græce") and a St. Petersburg manuscript (62 of Muralt's catalogue; — Muralt hazarded the conjecture that it contains the version of Theodotion). Lagarde's editing of these

chapters is an admirable exhibition of the way such things should be done; and deepens the regret that his great plan for a definitive edition of the LXX., the task of more than one man's life, was left unfinished.

The second Study was to be an investigation of the Old Testament text used by Clement of Alexandria, — that is, the Alexandrian text before Origen, — as exemplified in "*Stromata*," i. 21. He intended to print the chapter with notes indicating Clement's chief sources (Tatian, Cassian), etc. The great compositors' strike prevented the execution of this plan, and but four pages of the Greek text were printed. Prefixed to it is an examination of Tertullian's "*Apologeticum*," c. 19, in which Tertullian has evidently drawn from the same source as Clement; and this examination leads to a very interesting discovery. One of the MSS. of the "*Apologeticum*," the (lost) Codex Fuldensis, contains in this chapter a long interpolation which Lagarde shows by the use of parallel columns to be a fragment of another Latin apology, probably the same which, as Hartel proved, was used by both Minucius Felix and Tertullian. Jerome ("*De virus illustribus*," 53) seems to have known of but two Christian Latin writers before Tertullian, — Victor and Apollonius Senator. A scrap of writing from either of these men would be a precious find; particularly if we might believe that it is a part of the defense of Christianity which Apollonius made in the Roman Senate under Commodus. Even in our ignorance of its author, it is a welcome addition to our meagre knowledge of the early Roman apologists.

The third Study is a very valuable contribution to the study of the Old Latin text of the Old Testament, in the shape of two "*Outlines of Sacred History*." The first of these comes from North Africa; and a table at the end brings us down to the twenty-fourth year of Genserich. The second of the two pieces is clearly dependent upon this one, and serves to confirm its testimony. They add largely to our Old Latin quotations in books where we previously had but a scanty array. The full and careful indexes of Scripture passages and of proper names are, as a modest note on page 58 apprises us, the work of Frau de Lagarde. The problems which these pieces open up are briefly indicated by Lagarde on page 44; it is to be hoped that they may not be long neglected.

The last of these contributions to Septuagint criticism gives the Greek text of parts of a "*Brief Synopsis of the Old Testament*" from a manuscript in the National Library in Naples. The synopsis is that which is in some MSS. ascribed to Chrysostom, and was printed by Montfaucon in vol. vi. of his edition of that father. Its relation to the *Capitula* prefixed to Genesis in the Hexaplar Syriac version was recognized by Ceriani. The many interesting and important questions about this synopsis cannot be even touched upon here.

We close this volume with a deepened sense of the irreparable loss which Biblical learning has sustained in the death of Professor Lagarde. We shall never look upon his like again.

G. F. Moore.

CREATION OF THE BIBLE. By MYRON ADAMS. Pp. iv, 313. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; The Riverside Press, Cambridge. 1892.

There is great need at the present day of short, clearly written presentations of the constructive results of recent Biblical criticism. It is undoubtedly true, as this author says in his preface, that "there are many who are unable to content themselves with the notion of the infallibility of the writers of the Bible." It is also true that many of these will not struggle through the technicalities of criticism which so abound in the works of expert scholars. To all such a book like Gladden's "Who wrote the Bible?" has proved most helpful. This volume will now be welcomed as adding much to a definite understanding of the "change of attitude towards the Bible" which is taking place.

The author of this book does not profess to be a critic. His purpose has been to so present the results of criticism that they can be readily grasped and enable the reader to judge fairly of their positive value in making the Bible intelligible. The style is exceedingly clear and direct. The occasional illustrations are remarkably good in enforcing the thought.

Evidently the author intends to destroy as completely as possible all remnants of the theory of verbal inspiration and of Biblical infallibility in any literal sense. He recurs often to these "notions" for the purpose of hitting them again even after he has killed them. His references to "folk-lore," and "guesswork," to stories that are "absolutely unverifiable," to the "delirium" and "frenzy" of the apocalyptic vision, will probably prejudice some of his readers against the truth which he has to tell. But with the exception of occasional expressions which will seem to many unnecessarily abrupt, the facts about the Bible which have already been accepted by many if not by the majority of our leading Biblical scholars are distinctly and fairly stated.

It must be understood, however, that this book is not in any sense an introduction to the separate books of the Bible. The treatment is more general, separate books being cited only as illustration. The scope of the book may be seen from such chapter headings as: The New Method of Study, Ezra the Scribe (upon whom rather too much responsibility has been laid), History-Making, Traditional Sources, Legendary Elements, Prophecy, From Gods to God, The Fiction, The Poetry, Greek Influence, The First Christian Writings, The Miracles, Paul and the Second Advent, The Apocalypse of John, The Fourth the Gospel of the Present Tense, The Sociological Religion of James. Certain other chapter headings, such as: The Limitation, The Spiritual Basis, The Certainties, Conflict and Harmony, are less skillfully chosen, for they do not clearly designate the material which follows them.

The treatment of prophecy is especially good, the exposition of the book of Joel (pp. 96-102) being a very clear setting forth of the newer methods of prophetic interpretation. Many will hesitate to take without qualification all the author's comments on the book of Daniel

(pp. 112-118), but they will certainly find the case of the critics well stated.

It is in the treatment of the New Testament that the book is least satisfactory. The assertion that "what is true of the Old Testament is equally true of the New" (p. 163) will not pass without question. One would infer from this that as much uncertainty attended the questions of the composition, editorship and authorship, of the New Testament writings as of the Old. But this surely is not the case. Although there are many interesting questions of this sort concerning the New Testament still to be settled, yet the atmosphere surrounding these is much clearer.

The "miraculous element" in the Gospels is disposed of in altogether too summary a fashion. The virgin birth of Jesus is discarded because, among other reasons, "it shuts us out of sharing the divinity and character and life of the Son of God" (p. 195), — "Son" in the spiritual but not in the physical sense (p. 159). The story of the miracle at Cana of Galilee is "plainly of the magical order" (p. 219). Because the story of Lazarus is "not self-verifying" (p. 220) it is rejected. "The miracles recorded in the Bible," says the author, "have no scientific evidence. They are told us not by eye-witnesses, and not by persons who know anything, beyond the common, of a natural order" (p. 208).

In this connection it seems a somewhat serious omission that no reference is made to the resurrection of Jesus.

When one reads on another page (p. 201) that "it is possible that we shall presently apply the word ['miracle'] to the wonderful and the mysterious in nature, rather than to the irruption of supernatural powers within the scope of nature, to change or break the laws of nature," the query arises why the author could not have made this new application of the word to the miracles of Jesus. His main reason for discarding these seems to be the old and somewhat hollow objection that "such things do not happen" (p. 177).

One is also a little surprised to find Baur's theory of a bitter hostility between Paul and the other apostles reappearing in these pages. It would seem also as if the harmony between Paul's view of faith and James's view of "works" had been sufficiently demonstrated by this time.

But there are certain other portions of the author's treatment of the New Testament which are exceptionally strong and suggestive. The description of the influence on Paul and the other apostles of the mistaken views of Christ's second coming (chaps. xix., xx.), the characterization of the Fourth Gospel as the "Gospel of the Present Tense" because of its holding the emphasis upon what Jesus actually is rather than upon what He will be (chap. xxii.), and the closing chapter on the Sociological Religion of James, are to be noted.

Altogether the book is well done, and will enable the honest Bible student to obtain very many exceedingly helpful suggestions in regard to the true method of Biblical interpretation.

TAUNTON.

Edward H. Chandler.

THE CITY AND THE LAND. Palestine Exploration Fund. A course of seven lectures on the Work of the Society. 12mo, pp. 238. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1892.

Popularizations of modern discoveries in Palestine are valuable just so far as they are authoritative. That is one reason why "The City and the Land" should be welcomed. The book is a course of seven lectures on the work of the Palestine Exploration Fund which were delivered last summer in London to the delight of large and appreciative audiences. Well-known specialists were the lecturers. Wilson tells us of "Ancient Jerusalem," Conder of "The Future of Palestine," Tristram of its "Natural History," and Wright of "The Hittites," in four lucid, compact, entertaining and trustworthy chapters.

Specially worthy of note is Mr. Petrie's "Story of a Tell." A tell he defines as an artificial mound. In London the inhabitants live, really though not consciously, over one. "At the top of it we see our modern roads and foundations and bits of modern plates and dishes; then layers of dirty black earth and brickbats, perhaps the relics of the Great Fire; below that may be a 'grey-beard jug,' then a bit of Norman zigzag moulding, next a stray penny of Alfred, and below that a bit of Saxon walling patched up from Roman tiles. Then we come to the massive walls of Roman tile and concrete, and pieces of Samian ware; and below all perhaps a bronze sword of the ancient British warrior." All this is the accumulated dust and fragments of building after building, each of which has been leveled to be replaced by a successor. In the East such tells dot the landscape. An older civilization and a more perishable material have produced them in greater number, and abandoned towns and flat surfaces make them more conspicuous than in the West.

Tell-el-Hesi in Palestine is the site of ancient Lachish. There one season's work yielded Mr. Petrie potsherds which corresponded to the age of the Amorites, the Judges and the Jewish monarchy.

What Mr. Petrie found by scraping away a few feet of soil Mr. Bliss has corroborated by wheeling off half the town. At the top was the Greek pottery, and then came the earliest iron tools at the level assigned to the ninth century. A still greater prize appeared then in a jar-handle stamped with "The Palace of Ra-aa-Kherferu," which is the well-known title of Amenhotep II. This takes us back to the fifteenth century B. C. Several years ago the reviewer expressed the opinion publicly that cuneiform tablets would be discovered on Palestinian soil. In Tell-el-Hesi Mr. Bliss has found now such a tablet. The discovery is one of the greatest yet made in the Holy Land. According to Professor Sayce the script is like that of the famous Tell-el-Amarna tablets of the fifteenth century. Further, on it as on them we read the same name, Zimrida, as governor of Lachish. "We have thus at last picked up the other end of the broken chain of correspondence between Palestine and Egypt, and may hope now to recover the Palestinian part of this intercourse and so establish the pre-Israelite history of the land."

Mr. Petrie brings out two other points of absorbing interest to the student of the Bible. 1. There is a period between the death of Merenptah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and the last Egyptian raid on Palestine by Rameses III. closely corresponding to the Forty Years' Wandering of the Israelites in the wilderness. If the Amorites were exhausted by these Egyptian campaigns, they might well fall a ready prey to the sons of Abraham pouring in from the Eastern desert. 2. The nets of checkerwork on the twin columns of Solomon's Temple have puzzled the architects so that the latest writer has resorted to the basketwork capitals of *late* Roman time to explain the idea. But at Tell-el-Amarna, four centuries before Solomon, capitals with network patterns were found by Mr. Petrie, and with the Egyptian origin of the cornice at Lachish would seem to point back the Phœnician-Jewish architecture to its true origin on the Nile — in a "gigantic cloisonnée jewellery."

For those who have and those who have not access to the quarterly statements of the Palestine Exploration Fund, the "City and the Land" is a convenient, instructive, and useful book.

John Phelps Taylor.

THE CALL OF THE CROSS. Four College Sermons. By Rev. GEORGE D. HERRON, D. D. Introduction by President GEORGE A. GATES. Pp. 111. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company.

A preacher who will sound the note of the redemption of humanity rather than the saving of individual souls, who will lead men to see that the eternal life brought to the world in Jesus Christ is the power which is to transform the whole of humanity in all its relations, is the preacher who will most completely fulfil his mission.

These four sermons are from such a preacher. They are spirit and life because they have sprung from the source of spirit and life.

The treatment of Pilate's question, "What then shall I do with Jesus, which is called Christ?" is exceptionally vigorous. The Christian Church needs to learn more fully the truth that "no salvation is eternal that is not tremblingly wrought out by the inworking energy of God." The non-Christian world can be appealed to most effectively by being convinced that "no man ever casts the wealth of his life and the crown of his devotion at the feet of Jesus without quickening the earth with a diviner life, and uplifting it with new courage."

The preacher's figures are not always satisfactory. The expression "blood of God" (p. 78) does not strike one pleasantly. The mixed metaphor in the sentence, "Coddle and sculpture them as we will, our words are sure to lay bare our moral quality," etc., is a little confusing. But these are minor blemishes, and do not materially affect the virility of style and directness of speech which is a marked characteristic of each of these sermons.

Edward H. Chandler.

TAUNTON.

THE PAULINE THEOLOGY. A Study of the Origin and Correlation of the Doctrinal Teachings of the Apostle Paul. By GEO. B. STEVENS, PH. D., D. D. New York : Chas. Scribner's Sons. 1892. Pp. xi, 383.

The current of modern religious thought sets fast toward a correlation of the Biblical phenomena, those reported in the Scriptures and those of the Scriptures themselves, with the known laws and phenomena of what is known as secular history. This may or may not be a materialistic and atheistic tendency. If the unfounded and dangerous assumption is made that the divine and supernatural is visible only in the far-off, the unintelligible and unverifiable, the discovery of second causes dispensing with the need of a first cause, then every advance in the direction noted, every degree of progress in this explanation of the Scriptures, is a step toward irreligion. If, on the contrary, the true assumption is that the divine and the supernatural — not necessarily identical with the miraculous — is manifest as much, or more, in the near, the intelligible and verifiable, the fully classified, so far as the domain of secondary causes extends, then the modern tendency in Scripture study is thoroughly wholesome and beneficial. Only two types of reasoning are to be guarded against as thoroughly irreligious, both resting on the same false assumption above mentioned. On the one hand, there is the reactionary and obscurantist type, sometimes miscalled conservative, which has yet to learn the lesson of Peter's vision, that nothing of God's creation or providence is "common or unclean;" hence, that the bringing of Scripture phenomena under the categories of natural law does not "bring them down to the level of 'common' occurrences," though it may and should bring "common" occurrences up to their level. Minds of this type must, from the nature of the case, resist all progress in Biblical study, in terror of its atheistic and materialistic tendencies; since progress in the unintelligible and unverifiable there is none. On the other hand, there is a small but very disproportionately dreaded body of destructive critics properly so-called, who frame theories of secondary causation to account for all Biblical phenomena with the self-complacent but absurd idea that the need of a personal, that is, free and conscious, First Cause is thereby dispensed with. If any success attends these efforts it is a case where the wrath of man is made to praise the Lord, since the net result must inevitably be the leveling up of the secular, not the leveling down of the Biblical.

The occasion for these remarks is found in the truly conservative and progressive book before us. It is clear that the true line of progress for modern religious thought must lie midway between the extremes above described. What that exact middle line should be in all details it is the task of this and succeeding generations to discover. Professor Stevens will be regarded by some as not going far enough, by others too far; but none will deny his obvious candor and strict loyalty to the text. Indeed, it is one of the chief qualities of the book that it perpetually calls a halt upon the perpetual tendency, even of modern scholars, to ask, What

must have been the meaning of the writer? and substitutes for it the plain scientific query, What, on the principles of grammatico-historical exegesis, is the meaning of the writer? With this spirit of progressive conservatism, and the diligent use he has made of the great contributions to the subject by Pfeleiderer and Sabatier in recent times, together with the rich resources of the older introductory and exegetical literature, it was certain that Professor Stevens would render a real service to progressive theology. Thus, while the book is more distinguished by a careful and judicious adaptation of the results of modern study than by startlingly new points of view or pioneer investigations, the author is by no means a mere compiler, but an independent thinker; so that the product of his work is a unit with a character of its own, and not a mere conglomerate. With all the advantage taken of modern researches into the secondary causes of Paul's conversion and work he adheres firmly to the supernaturalistic point of view, sometimes even seeming to go further in this direction than the judgment of scholarship would allow, as, for example, in maintaining that the words heard by Paul at his conversion, "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," have no reference to internal compunctions of the persecutor's mind and conscience, but only to the futility of his endeavor to quench the rising faith.

The scheme of the book is of the usual type, chapters i.-iv. being devoted to Paul's conversion, his style and modes of thought, the shaping forces of his teaching, and a discussion of the sources; the remaining nine chapters to the various doctrines of Paul's theology. Herein the author goes beyond the point of good service rendered to progressive theology as a science, and shows his special gift in the presentation in condensed and lucid form of results gathered from a wide field and well digested. In the chapter on Style and Modes of Thought, for example, there is an admirable presentation of Paul's "mystic realism," the apprehension of which is the necessary antecedent to correct interpretation, and the failure to understand it the fatal mistake of the Augustinian systems.

If any fault were to be found with this concise and lucid exposition of modern thought on the beginnings of Christian theology, it is one which it shares with all discussions of the Pauline Theology now recalled to mind. The title promises "a discussion of the origin and correlation of the doctrinal teachings of Paul." This does not necessarily include a discussion of their relation with the Johannine type of thought, though we could wish "correlation" had been so intended. But the "origin" of these teachings should certainly in our judgment include a more explicit study of their relation to the traditional teaching of Jesus, with which, whether through his pre-Christian or later experience, Paul certainly came in contact, and which was *the influence par excellence* which changed his theology from a Pharisean to a Christian type. If this is indeed to be counted a sin of omission, the exception only emphasizes the general verdict of hearty commendation which must be pronounced by

all competent readers upon this concise, candid, and scholarly contribution to a theology both progressive and orthodox.

Benj. W. Bacon.

OSWEGO, N. Y.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. *Christianus sum : Christiani nihil alienum a me puto.* Vol. VII. Modern Christianity. *The Swiss Reformation.* New York : Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892. Pp. xvii, 890. \$4.00.

Dr. Schaff, himself a Switzer, and a Reformed, has treated a domestic theme in this volume with that fullness, diffuseness, indeed, which it claims at his hand, and which he was sure of finding acceptable to those every day extending regions of the world whose Christianity rests on Reformed foundations. It is true, even his sympathetic treatment, and the lucidity with which he turns out to the view all the folds and recesses of the subject, cannot give to it the fascination of the Lutheran Reformation. No accumulation of eminent personalities, even crowned by the greatness of Calvin, can bind us to it as we feel ourselves bound to the developing life, and fortunes, and character, and experience, and rude heroism of Brother Martin. The Alps are great, but the Himalaya rise twice as far into the sky. Besides, although the Swiss Reformation is as old as the Lutheran, and independent of it, it did not come to its full development until the secondary stage of the original movement. Moreover, while for Germany, our imaginations kindle at the Nailing of the Theses, the Burning of the Bull, the Appearance at Worms, and even at the Protest of Spires and the Presentation of the Augstana, amid scenes crowded with electoral, episcopal, ducal splendor, surrounded by the multitudinous sovereignties of the ancient Reich, and encircling the uniqueness of the Cæsarean Majesty, the Swiss Reformation hardly gives us more than the Conference at Marburg, the death of Zwingli, and the burning of Servetus. The happy homeliness of republican Switzerland is far better intrinsically than the "sceptred pall" of monarchical states, but less effective to the mind's eye. Merle D'Aubigné, indeed, has given extraordinary dramatic liveliness to his pictures of the fires of reformation leaping from Alpine height to height; but his overstrained rhetoric is so intent on making out every fourth-rate evangelist of the new doctrine a star of the first magnitude that we feel rather ashamed of our enthusiasm after we have come to years of discretion. Dr. Schaff, on the other hand, who gives us far distincter pictures of the Swiss Reformers, surcharged with the most cordial sympathy, showing him to be contemporary at once with them and with us, preserves all the proportions.

Dr. Schaff brings out with peculiar distinctness the remarkable disinterestedness of all the Reformers, German and Swiss alike, early Franciscan self-forgetfulness, purified of asceticism, and kindling into the pure

happiness of innumerable pastoral homes. This charm, either intrinsically, or through the skill of the historian, seems to rest in peculiar fullness on the Swiss Reformation, and may easily reconcile us to its comparative poverty in tragic grandeurs.

The author gives some five hundred pages to Calvin specifically, presenting him on every side. Besides his general qualifications, no one could do it so justly as a German and Reformed Switzer, united in nation to the Genevan Frenchman, and distinguished from him in race, and protected by the Melancthonian mildness of the church in which he was bred from the imperiousness of either wing of the Reformation. Under his guidance we find Calvin growing more admirable and estimable at every step, while the author renounces from the beginning, as impossible, the endeavor to bring him into our hearts! We can no more think of loving him than of loving his elder brother Hildebrand, whose work, in its time, was equally indispensable and equally relentless.

The History gives over a hundred pages to Servetus, whom it first makes known to our general public in his remarkable and many-sided intellectual greatness, as well as in his impracticable Spanish fantasticalness and pride, a Quixote whose contest with forces beyond him did not end with sweeping him to the ground, but with sweeping him into the flames. Dr. Schaff remarks very instructively on the mutual attraction and repulsion which have never allowed Calvinism and Unitarianism to live together in peace or to live apart. They seem to stand inexorably in need of each other, and yet never to have found the reconciling middle term. The Nicene theology appears to have room for both, but as yet not to have been interpreted in sufficient largeness. Of course, we refer to Christian Unitarianism, not to that nihilistic nebulosity which swims around it.

The author gives a full account of the unrighteous and cruel measures by which the Protestants of the Valtelline endeavored to maintain their endangered ascendancy, and of the terrible ferocity of the Catholic reprisals. The Reformed here took the sword and perished with the sword. Of course, he shows no more sympathy in this volume than in the others with that spirit of rebellion against the Redeemer which substitutes Luther or Calvin in his place, and identifies Protestantism with Christianity. He rejoices that the old church and the new survive together in Switzerland, helping each other, whether they will or no, in the common service. He gives a very full and appreciative description of the Anabaptist movements, remarking that even the excesses of Munster have been exaggerated, and carefully distinguishing the genuine Christianity of the essential tendency, as now realized in the Mennonites and the Baptists, from the exaggerations, doctrinal and practical — dismal enough, many of them — that played along its fringes. It is interesting to see how the final victory of evangelical freedom caused the abnormal tension of earlier reforming tendencies to subside, after a time of dangerous explosions, within ethical and civic limits.

We add a few miscellaneous remarks. The marriage of Zwingli, before the *Lex Clandestinitatis*, would not have been vitiated for Roman Catholic doctrine by its secrecy (it would not now, in large parts of the Church), but would have been so by his being a priest. — Zwingli, it appears, held that Scipio and Cicero would be saved, but was not sure just when or where their evangelical consciousness would unclose. It is cheering to know, that he could have pushed through the needle's eye which our friends Covell and Noyes found too narrow for them, although he would have had to postpone his application until the secondary stage of enlargement had been reached. — It may be questioned whether the Doctor is quite just to Erasmus for declining to join the Reformation formally, or rather it might be if he had not given the other side in the previous volume. — P. 121, "he did not show the graces to the muses." This phrase we find unintelligible. — P. 157, "the exiles bred revenge," for "*meditated* revenge." — In several places we find "*suffering of*" for "*suffering from*." — P. 461, "mobocracy," for "ochlocracy." — P. 505, the author thinks that Calvin should have remembered that it is foolish and dangerous to quarrel with a woman. But the woman in question seems to have been a very Jezebel, that needed some restraint. It seems doubtful, after all, whether Calvin succeeded in imposing it.

The author disposes effectually of the notion that the reformed government of Geneva was theocratic. It was strictly Christian, and Protestant, but only through the free will of a free people, acting through their lay magistrates. The ministers were not even eligible to office, and were dependent on the state for their very living. Calvin's control was like that of Pericles, that ascendancy of a great character to which, as Macaulay rightly says, it is the peculiar glory of free peoples to submit themselves. It was moral, religious, intellectual, but absolutely unhierarchical.

The author quotes Archdeacon Farrar on Calvin's straightforward disdain of the attempts to explain away the occasional historical discrepancies of the sacred writers, or their slips of memory. He was fortunate in living in Geneva, and not in Cincinnati.

The author, in quoting Dr. Martineau's reference to the Spanish Inquisition, would have done well to correct Martineau's exaggeration of the number of Torquemada's victims, resulting from his unadvised trust in Llorente, the fantastic vagaries of whose statistics Hefele has sufficiently exposed. Divide the number by four, or six, and there is enough left for any reasonable appetite of horror-hunting. It would have been well also to correct Martineau's preposterous description of Torquemada as burning Jews for refusing to turn Christian, something that no inquisitor ever dreamed he had a right to do since there was an inquisition. Mr. Henry C. Lea points out how, before the expulsion, conversions were largely at a stay, just because the unbaptized Jews were not minded to come thereby under the jurisdiction of the Holy Office.

Dr. Schaff holds the Syllabus to be *ex cathedra*. Cardinal Newman holds the reverse. As the latter was raised to the purple after publishing

this opinion, it is to be presumed that Leo, though concurring with much of it, does not require it to be held "with a divine faith." The doublings and turnings of Rome concerning the Five Propositions are an instructive parallel.

Dr. Schaff gives a charming picture, full of life and color, of his native canton of the Grisons, and, in brief, a very interesting history, hitherto quite unknown to us and our public, of the fortunes of this triple group of confederacies before — it seems not until 1805 — it was absorbed in the Helvetic Confederation. His testimony is interesting, that in Switzerland Protestantism and Catholicism are about equal morally, and Protestantism superior intellectually. We should judge that Catholicism is supposed to have a certain advantage devotionally.

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PETER, and THE REVELATION OF PETER.

Two Lectures on the newly recovered Fragments together with the Greek Texts. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B. D., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Christ's College, and MONTAGUE RHODES JAMES, M. A., Fellow and Dean of King's College. Second Edition. Pp. 96. London: C. J. Clay & Sons, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Ave Maria Lane. 1892. 2s. 6d. Cloth, 3s.

THE NEWLY RECOVERED GOSPEL OF SAINT PETER. With a full Account of the Same. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. Pp. 67. New York: James Pott & Co. 1893.

RECENTLY DISCOVERED EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCUMENTS. I. The Gospel of Peter. II. The Apocalypse of Peter. ARTHUR C. HEADLAM, in the "Guardian," December 7 and 14, 1892.

BRUCHSTÜCKE DES EVANGELIUMS UND DER APOKALYPSE DES PETRUS. Von ADOLF HARNACK. Pp. 78. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 1893.

In the winter of 1886-87 the opening of a tomb at Akhmim (Panopolis), Upper Egypt, brought to light a parchment codex which was found to contain fragments of three ancient works, namely, The Gospel according to Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Book of Enoch. Last year M. Bouriant, the head of the French Archæological School at Cairo, published these fragments. With his usual alertness Professor Harnack called attention to the discovery, especially that of the Petrine fragments, at sessions of the Royal Prussian Academy of Science held on November 3 and 10. The next month he published, in the pamphlet whose title is given above, a revised text of the Petrine documents, with translations and a remarkably full and suggestive commentary. There is also a convenient vocabulary for each fragment. The enterprising school of younger Cambridge scholars obtained M. Bouriant's texts the 17th of November, and three days later Mr. Armitage Robinson delivered a lecture in the Hall of Christ's College on the newly recovered portion of

the "Gospel according to Peter," and Mr. James soon gave to the press a lecture on the fragment of the "Revelation." Mr. Robinson's lecture, revised and enlarged, was published with it in the little volume whose title stands at the head of this notice. The printing is noticeably accurate, the Greek texts are carefully revised, and are accompanied with excellent translations and valuable introductions, notes, and comments. The volume is very creditable to its authors, and has passed into a second edition. Mr. Rendel Harris's interesting discussion of the "Gospel" soon followed that of Messrs. Robinson and James. It is written in an attractive style, and gives, with a translation, such information as puts the "Gospel" suitably before readers who are unacquainted with Greek. The comments will also be appreciated by technical scholars. Mr. Headlam's articles in the "Guardian" began before the publication of the Lectures by Mr. Robinson and Mr. James, and are admirably prepared both as respects the information they give and critical comment.

All the writers to whom we have referred accept M. Bouriant's identification of the Petrine fragments with the lost Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter. There is a noteworthy agreement as respects suggested improvements of the text as it was first published. Some of these, it is said, appear in M. Bouriant's French version. Further examination of the MS., which Mr. Robinson thinks is in the Gizeh Museum at Cairo, will doubtless be made.

Mr. Robinson finds in the simplicity of the narrative an indication of early origin, "nearer to the beginning than to the middle of the second century." He does not claim that so early a date can now be proved, but only that it would not be surprising if further evidence should tend to this conclusion. Mr. Harris dwells on the resemblances between this fragment and Tatian's "Diatessaron," but refrains at present from giving an opinion as to whether either author is dependent on the other, or whether both used a common source. He thinks that the legendary matter in the fragment can hardly have originated early in the second century. The author "may turn out to be between Tatian and Serapion,¹ and nearer to the former than the latter; or he may be between the time of the translator Aquila (in the reign of Hadrian²) and the time of Serapion."³ Elsewhere he says: "So everything leads us to believe that the Gospel of Peter must have been written a good while before the year 190."⁴ Mr. Headlam thinks "that it was written probably in Antioch early in the second century, and was used by Justin Martyr, and that it is a Gnostic compilation which makes use of all four Canonical Gospels." He adds: "It must be distinctly understood, however, that these conclusions, although very probable, have been in no way demonstrated." Mr. Robinson and Mr. Harris agree with Mr. Headlam in the opinion that

¹ That is, between about 170 and 190 A. D.

² A. D. 117-138.

³ A. D. 190-203.

⁴ Pp. 62, 27.

the author has drawn upon all the Gospels in our New Testament. The earlier, therefore, the date of the Petrine Gospel is carried, the earlier is shown to be the use of these Canonical Gospels. The English writers, also, agree that the "Gospel according to Peter" is a "Tendenzschrift," Gnostic and Docetic. Mr. Robinson says: "He [the author] uses our Greek Gospels; there is no proof (though the possibility of course is always open) that he knew of any Gospel record other than these." Mr. Harris thinks it "hardly possible" to decide this last point — the use of other sources — without more thorough investigation.

Dr. Harnack differs widely from the English scholars at important points, and is much less cautious and reserved in drawing probable conclusions. The results which seem to him to be most clearly indicated are these: 'The Gospel of Peter, as well as our Canonical Gospels, is an independent attempt to write the evangelical history. Its author probably used as a chief source Mark's Gospel, though this cannot be strictly proved. It is possible that he stood in no direct literary dependence upon either of our Gospels, but drew with their authors from the same stream of tradition and legend, which had only in part assumed a written form. In his account of the resurrection he uses similar traditions, written or oral, with our Matthew, which points to a probable origin in Syria-Palestine. Perhaps he was acquainted with the Fourth Gospel and used it; the converse is not credible on account of the juvenility of the account of the resurrection. We cannot decide whether he was acquainted with Luke's Gospel or only with Luke's sources. He resorted to traditions which deviate from the Canonical Gospels, in general are not found in them, but are not to be collectively rejected so far as they offer modified parallel reports to those used by the Evangelists. Since the four Gospels are not equally used, and our Matthew appears to be unknown, and in view of the method and means of the writer and the probable use of his work by Justin, it is to be assigned to the beginning of the second century. It was not written for a sect, though it contains Encratitic and Docetic elements which caused it at a later time to appear heretical, as indeed it had then passed into a use by heretics. The disproportionate extent of the account of the resurrection in comparison with the brevity of the history of the passion is a proof of the taste for legendary construction. The account offers no point of support for the supposition that it has itself received later additions.'

The most important difference between Dr. Harnack's view and that of the English critics lies in his attempt to set the "Gospel according to Peter" into the same relation to the early traditions, oral and written, with the Canonical Gospels, especially the First. He denies the Gnostic origin of the Petrine Gospel, or that it sprung from any party outside of the Christian body. He concedes, however, that it was written to subserve the purpose of a "definite tendency" within the Christianity of its time, and that it has "Docetic-Gnostic characteristics." But if it

is Docetic, — and unless this be admitted it ceases to be the Gospel described by Serapion, — is it possible to appraise it as Dr. Harnack does? Even if it originated in a "tendency" which had not yet become a pronounced "heresy" or "sect," the taint is no less in its blood. It is already a disparaged witness.

Nor is it yet brought to evidence that it did spring from a party not yet separated from the Church. When it first comes to light, close upon the end of the second century, it is making trouble in the parish of Rhossus or Rhosus, a Syrian city on the Gulf of Issus. Some members of this church put forward a Gospel under the name of Peter. Apparently their use of it occasioned ill feeling. Serapion, bishop of Antioch, A. D. 190-203, visited the parish, and learned of this trouble. He had not read the document; he supposed all the members of the church were sound in the faith, and said, either to the church, or, as Zahn supposes, to those who had favored the Gospel: "If this is all that makes ill feeling among you, let [it] be read." Subsequently he learned that its approvers were not as orthodox as he had assumed, that they were involved in some heresy. He obtained a copy of the Gospel they were using from the successors of those who first employed it, and who (namely, these successors) were called "Docetae," — a title, as we otherwise learn, then applied to a sect reputed to have been started by Julius Cassian, an Encratite teacher of the second half or last third of the second century. Serapion connects the "heresy" at Rhosus with the teaching of this sect, from whom he obtained the Gospel in question. The first definite appearance of this Gospel, therefore, is in associations which are in most marked contrast with those of the Canonical Gospels in their earliest known use.

If Justin Martyr availed himself of this Gospel this implies an earlier origin than the time of its first use according to Serapion. A number of coincidences are thought by some critics to make probable Justin's resort to it. If this is conceded the question still is open: What sort of use does he make of it? The evidence, however, that he used it at all is not strong, much less decisive. Too many documents, known to us as yet by little more than their titles, were in circulation to enable us to be confident, through verbal coincidences, of literary dependence upon some one of them in particular. In the present instance, in one of the two most marked resemblances between Justin and the Gospel, the former adds: "And that these things happened you can learn from the 'Acts of Pontius Pilate'" — a lost work. There is always open, also, the possibility of a common source, and though documents should not be multiplied conjecturally beyond what is necessary, neither should the danger of premature identification be ignored. When it is claimed that Justin's reference, according to the present text, to "Memoirs" of Peter, confirms the supposition that he drew from the Gospel now before us, we are not convinced. Justin is comparing the change of Simon's name

to Peter, and of the sons of Zebedee to Boanerges, to that of Jacob into Israel, and of Oshea (Αἰσῆ) into Jesus (Joshua). He says the former changes are affirmed in his, that is, Peter's Memoirs. Now Mark's Gospel, alone of the Canonical Gospels, contains these changes. Justin probably recognizes this Gospel elsewhere. It was associated with Peter. Is it likely that having this Gospel, containing precisely the facts he is affirming, he would refer for his authority to a document of which we have no trace in the acknowledged use of the churches? The difficulty is increased by its Docetic character. Justin lays much stress on the sufferings of Jesus. Three chapters earlier he refers to the account in our Gospels of the agony of Gethsemane, and says that this was "in order that we may know that the Father wished his Son truly to undergo such sufferings for us, and that we may not say that He, being Son of God, did not feel what was happening to Him and befalling Him."¹ Is it probable that an opponent of Docetism would name a Docetic Gospel as his authority in preference to an acknowledged one? It may prove that he used the former; he seems to have drawn from sources of information outside of our Gospels. But that he mentions it in the passage before us is, to say the least, very doubtful.

When we further bear in mind that the Docetism of the newly recovered fragment bears a closer resemblance to that which meets us in the second half of the second century than to that which is so strongly condemned in the Ignatian letters, we cannot but think that we are not yet warranted in assuming an earlier date for the Gospel than about A. D. 160. On the other hand there is nothing in what has so far appeared to make an earlier date impossible, and investigation needs to be carried farther than time has so far permitted at many points. Meanwhile our thanks are due to Dr. Harnack for most valuable suggestions for such studies, as well as to the English scholars whom we have named.

Egbert C. Smyth.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

N. J. Bartlett & Co., Boston.

MITCHELL, H. G. Amos : An Essay in Exegesis. 1893. Pp. 209.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston.

SHALER, N. S. The Interpretation of Nature. Pp. xi, 305. \$1.25.

THAYER, W. R. The Dawn of Italian Independence. Vol. i. Pp. 453. Vol. ii. Pp. 446. \$4.00.

Roberts Brothers, Boston.

GRATRY, A. Guide to the Knowledge of God. Translated by Abby L. Alger. Pp. xi, 469. \$3.00.

Harper & Brothers, New York.

HURST, J. F. Short History of the Christian Church. Pp. xxxv, 672.

BOWNE, B. P. The Principles of Ethics. Pp. xv, 309.

¹ See *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. ciii.; comp. chaps. xeviii., xcix.

- The Baker & Taylor Co., New York.*
PIERSON, A. T. Love in Wrath. Pp. 40. 35 cents.
- The Christian Literature Co., New York.*
SCHAFF AND WACE. Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Second Series. Vol. IV. Athanasius: Select Works and Letters. Pp. xci, 606.
- THE CHURCH, and Her Doctrine.** By the Lord Bishop of Sydney and other Clergymen of the Church of England. Pp. 309.
- Office of the Daily Investigator, New York.*
CORNWALLIS, K. The Song of America and Columbus. Pp. 278. \$1.00.
- Fords, Howard & Hulbert, New York.*
BEECHER, H. W. Bible Studies. Edited from Stenographic Notes by J. R. Howard. Pp. 438. \$1.50.
- Funk & Wagnalls, New York.*
MACDONALD, A. Criminology. Pp. xiv, 416.
- Hunt & Eaton, New York. Cranston & Curtis, Cincinnati.*
BEET, J. A. Through Christ to God. Pp. xx, 373.
- Longmans, Green & Co., New York.*
BONNEY, T. G. Christian Doctrines and Modern Thought. Pp. xx, 175.
- Macmillan & Co., London and New York.*
ARISTOTLE. Nichomachean Ethics. Translated, with an Analysis and Critical Notes, by J. E. C. Welldon. Pp. xviii, 352. \$2.00.
- BLACK, J. S.** The Book of Judges. Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools. Pp. 116. 30 cents. (University Press, Cambridge.)
- KIRKPATRICK, A. F.** The Doctrine of the Prophets. Warburtonian Lectures for 1886-1890. Pp. xviii, 540. \$1.75.
- MAYOR, J. B.** The Epistle of St. James. Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Comments. Pp. cexx, 248.
- ROUNDELL, Earl of Selborne.** Hymns: their History and Development in the Greek and Latin Churches, Germany and Great Britain. Pp. 216. \$1.25. (Adam & Charles Black, London and Edinburgh.)
- STRAUSS, D. FR.** Life of Jesus. Translated from the fourth German edition by George Eliot. 2d ed. Pp. 784. \$4.50.
- THE CITY AND THE LAND.** Seven Lectures on the Work of the Palestine Exploration Society. Pp. 238. \$1.25.
- WESTCOTT, B. F.** The Gospel of Life. Pp. xxiv, 306. \$1.75.
- WILLIAMS, C. M.** A Review of the Systems of Ethics Founded on the Theory of Evolution. Pp. xvi, 581. \$2.60.
- XENOPHON.** Works: Translated by H. G. Dakyn. Vol. II. Hellenica, Books iii.-vii., Agesilaus, The Politics and Revenues. Pp. xcii, 395. \$2.50.
- Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.*
 (Adam & Charles Black, Edinburgh).
LEES, J. C. Life and Conduct. Pp. viii, 114.
- M'CLYMONT, J. A.** The New Testament and its Writers. Pp. vi, 155.
- MUIR, P. M.** The Church of Scotland. Pp. 96.
- STEWART, A.** Handbook of Christian Evidences. Pp. ix, 94.
- Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago and New York.*
TANNER, E. A. Baccalaureate and other Sermons and Addresses. Pp. 440. \$1.50.
- Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.*
BRIGGS, C. A. The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. Pp. xii, 259. \$1.75.

- THE CRITICAL REVIEW of Theological and Philosophical Literature. Vol. ii. Pp. 449. \$2.50. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)
- DEFENSE OF PROFESSOR BRIGGS before the Presbytery of New York. Pp. xx, 193. 50 cents.
- GRANVILLE, A. The Fallen Race. Pp. 352. 50 cents.
- HAMILTON, T. Beyond the Stars. Pp. 270. \$1.50. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)
- McCOSH, J. Our Moral Nature. Pp. 53. 75 cents.
- MORIARTY, G. P. Dean Swift and his Writings. Pp. iv, 341. \$2.50.
- SCHULTZ, H. Old Testament Theology. Translated from the fourth German edition by J. A. Paterson. Vol. i. Pp. x, 438. Vol. ii. Pp. vi, 470. 18 shillings. (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.)
- VACARESCO, H. The Bard of the Cimbovitza. Roumanian Folk-Songs. Translated by Carmen Sylva and Alma Strettell. Pp. viii, 130. \$1.75. (James R. Osgood, McIlvaine & Co., London.)
- Thomas Whittaker, New York.*
- CHEYNE, T. K. Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism. Pp. viii, 397. \$2.50.
- Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh.*
- MATHESON, G. The Distinctive Messages of the Old Religions. Pp. vii, 342. \$1.75. (Imported by Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.)
- C. J. Clay & Sons, London.*
- BEVAN, A. A. The Book of Daniel. Pp. xii, 235.
- ROBINSON, J. A., and JAMES, M. R. The Gospel according to Peter, and the Revelation of Peter. 2d ed. Pp. 96.
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London.*
- WATSON, F. The Book of Genesis. Pp. 288. 3 shillings.
- C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, Braunschweig.*
- THEOLOGISCHER JAHRESBERICHT. Elfter Band: die Literatur des Jahres 1891. Dritte Abtheilung: Systematische Theologie. Pp. 343-450. 4 M. Vierte Abtheilung: Praktische Theologie und kirchliche Kunst. Pp. x, 451-658. 5 M.
- J. C. B. Mohr, Freiburg i. B.*
- KATTENBUSCH, F. Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde. Dritte Lieferung (Schluss des ersten Bandes). Pp. xxv, 353-555.
- KRAUSS, A. Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie. Bd. II. Katechetik. Pastoraltheorie. Pp. x, 461. 9 M.
- SAMMLUNG ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellschriften. Viertes Heft. Augustin. De Catechizandis Rudibus. Hrg. von A. Wolfhard. Pp. xi, 78. 1.40 M.
- ZEITSCHRIFT für Theologie und Kirche. Hefte 5, 6. 1892. Pp. 369-468, 469-534. Jahrgang (6 Hefte) 6 M. Pro Heft, 2 M.
- Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.*
- BAETHGEN, FR. Die Psalmen. Pp. xliii, 451. 8.20 M.
- DUHM, B. Das Buch Jesaia. Pp. xxi, 485. 8.20 M.